

New Series

Volume I, Number 4

October 1950

The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

Editor

JOHN BUTT, B.LITT., M.A.

Secretary

JANET HESELTINE

CONTENTS

Virtue is the True Nobility. A Study of the Structure of <i>All's Well that Ends Well</i> . By M. C. Bradbrook	289
Leontes a Jealous Tyrant. By Paul N. Siegel	302
Fulke Greville's Dramatic Characters. By Peter Ure	308
Coleridge and Southey in Bristol, 1795. By George Whalley	324

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

An English Allusion to Montaigne before 1595. (M. Dominica Legge)	341
A Note on <i>Henry V</i> , Act IV. (Allan Wilkinson)	345
Dryden's French Borrowings (E. A. Horsman)	346

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 8/6 net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 30/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, M.A., D.Lit.; DOROTHY EVERETT, M.A.; SIR WALTER W. GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, M.A., D.Litt.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; F. P. WILSON, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., D.Lit., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editor, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o Clarendon Press, Oxford. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (*continued*)

REVIEWS, ETC.: Anglo-Saxon Magic, by G. Storms, 352; Postscript on *Beowulf*, by S. O. Andrew, 353; A Commentary on the General Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, by Muriel Bowden, 357; Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes, by R. S. Loomis, 358; Rollo Duke of Normandy or The Bloody Brother, by John Fletcher and others, ed. J. D. Jump, 360; The Court Wits of the Restoration, by J. H. Wilson, 362; The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy, by J. H. Smith, 362; The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne, by E. N. Dilworth, 364; Laurence Sterne's 'Sermons of Mr. Yorick', by L. van der H. Hammond, 364; The Triumph of Form. A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet, by W. C. Brown, 366; Ten English Farces, ed. L. Hughes and A. H. Scouten, 368; Jane Austen. Facts and Problems, by R. W. Chapman, 368; Wordsworth's View of Nature and its Ethical Consequences, by N. Lacey, 370; The Cowden Clarkes, by R. D. Altick, 372; The Life of Edward FitzGerald, Translator of *The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám*, by A. M. Terhune, 373; W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet, by A. N. Jeffares, 375; The Great Tradition, by F. R. Leavis, 377; Forms of Modern Fiction. Essays collected in honor of Joseph Warren Beach, ed. W. Van O'Connor, 377; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 381; List of publications received, 387; Index, 390.

The Review of English Studies

VOL. I, NEW SERIES, NO. 4

OCTOBER 1950

VIRTUE IS THE TRUE NOBILITY

A Study of the Structure of *All's Well that Ends Well*

By M. C. BRADBROOK

ALL'S Well that Ends Well might have as its sub-title 'Two Plays in One'. In this article I shall be concerned with one of the plays only—the play that is revealed by the structure and the plot. Such a partial and one-sided approach is justified because, I believe, it reveals the governing idea¹ of the whole composition. This is perhaps a dangerous assumption, for

in attempting to isolate the idea that governs a play we run the risk of fixing it and deadening it, especially when the idea discerned is expressed as a philosophical proposition and stated in a sentence or two.²

The governing idea of this particular play is one which I believe belongs rather to Shakespeare's age than to all time. To display it therefore requires what may seem a humourless and over-detailed study of the background of ideas. The method by which the idea is presented is not quite Shakespeare's usual one, though not unlike that discerned by modern critics elsewhere in his work.³ No one could dare to suggest that Shakespeare took a moral idea and dressed it up in human terms; yet the allegorical mode of thought and the conception that literature should promote good actions were still very much alive in his day. They were not secure.⁴ Shakespeare himself, in that period of the mid-nineties when he more or less has the stage to himself—the period between the death of Marlowe and the arrival of Jonson—transformed the conception of dramatic art and produced those ripe and humane works which for ever made impossible such plays as Robert Wilson's.

¹ See Nevill Coghill, 'The Governing Idea, Essays in the Interpretation of Shakespeare—I', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, i (1948), pp. 9-16.

² Coghill, loc. cit.

³ e.g. Tillyard, Rossiter, Bethell, Danby.

⁴ Cf. Rosemary Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948), pp. 19-22.

The modern reader of *All's Well*—‘the new Cambridge production is the first for many years’—may feel that the play contains one superb character study, that of Bertram; and at least one speech of great poetic power, Helena’s confession to the Countess. Seen through Helena’s eyes Bertram is handsome, brave, ‘the glass of fashion and the mould of form’: seen through the eyes of the older characters he is a degenerate son, an undutiful subject, a silly boy. The two images blend in the action, as we see him sinking from irresponsibility to deceit, but making a name for himself in the wars. He ends in an abject position, yet Helena’s devotion continues undiminished. Her medieval counterpart, patient Griselda, whose virtues are passive, is not called on for more than obedience,¹ and the audience need not stop to wonder what kind of a person the Marquis could be, whether such barbarity could be justified as an assay of virtue, and how the final revelation could leave his wife with any palate for his company. As a character, he exists only to demonstrate Griselda’s patience. But Bertram is not ‘blackened out’ in this way. The connexion of his character and Helena’s feelings with the general theme can be explained, but they are not identified with it.

In *All's Well* the juxtaposition of the social problem of high birth versus native merit and the human problem of unrequited love recalls the story of the Sonnets; the speeches of Helena contain echoes from the Sonnets,² but the story to which her great speeches are loosely tied does not suit their dramatic expression. It illustrates the nature of social distinctions, of which the personal situation serves only as example. It might be hazarded that this first tempted Shakespeare, who then found himself saying more, or saying other, than his purely structural purpose could justify. Helena’s speech to the Countess is the poetic centre of the play, but the structural centre is the King’s judgement on virtue and nobility. For once, the dramatist and the poet in Shakespeare were pulling different ways. *All's Well that Ends Well* expresses in its title a hope that is not fulfilled; all did not end well, and it is not a successful play.

My contention is that *All's Well* fails because Shakespeare was trying to write a moral play, a play which he proposed to treat with the gravity proper, for example, to ‘a moral history’.³ He was not writing allegorically, but his characters have a symbolic and extra-personal significance. To

¹ Helena shows herself similarly passive in her two scenes as wife (II. iv, v). Unlike Parolles, she calls Bertram her ‘master’, both before and after marriage (I. iii. 166, III. iv. 9).

² Helena’s three great speeches (I. i. 91–110, I. iv. 199–225, III. ii. 102–32) have a number of parallels with the sonnets, especially the second of the three. Cf. Sonnets xxvi, lvii, lviii, lxxxvii. The way in which Bertram is condemned recalls also the plain speaking which is so unusual a feature of the Sonnets (e.g. xxxv, lxxvii, lxxxii, lxxxiv, xcv, xcvi).

³ A term defined by A. P. Rossiter in his edition of *Woodstock* (London, 1948): roughly, a chronicle history built on a moral theme.

write such a play the writer must be detached and in complete control of his material; and Shakespeare was not happy when he was theorizing. Here he is not driven to bitter or cynical or despairing comment on the filth that lies below the surface of life. Instead of the stews of Vienna, the activities of Pandarus and Thersites, we have the highly moral comments of the young Lords on Bertram. Yet compared with *Measure for Measure*—to which it is most closely linked by similarities of plot¹—the play appears more confused in purpose, more drab and depressing, if less squalid. Both are concerned with what Bacon called Great Place; the one with the nature and use of power, the other with the nature and grounds of true nobility. The characters are occasionally stiffened into types: the King becomes *Vox Dei*, which means that he is merely a voice. Yet at other times, but chiefly in soliloquy, deep personal feeling breaks through. Angelo's temptations and Helena's love are not completely adjusted to the stories which contain them. These feelings burst out irrepressibly, and in a sense irrelevantly, though they are the best things in the plays.

To compare *Measure for Measure* with its source play, *Promos and Cassandra*, is to see the shaping process of imagination at work: to compare *All's Well* with Painter's translation of Boccaccio is at least revealing.² The alterations are perfectly consistent, tending to greater dependence, humility, and enslavement on Helena's part and greater weakness and falsehood on Bertram's. New characters are added to voice Helena's claims to virtue and dignity—this is the chief purpose of the Countess, Lafeu, and the additions to the King's part—while others are created to stigmatize Bertram. An outline of Painter will make this clear.

Giletta of Narbonne is brought up with Beltramo and several other children; though not noble she is rich, and refuses many suitors for love of him. After his departure she waits some time—years are implied—before following him, and she sees him before she seeks the King. The conditions of her bargain are that she cures the King in eight days or she offers to be burnt, the King spontaneously adding that he will give her a husband if she succeeds. She asks the right to choose and, somewhat to the royal chagrin, names Beltramo. The King almost apologizes to the firmly protesting Count, but pleads that he has given his royal word. After the wedding Giletta goes to Rossiglione, puts the estate in order, tells the

¹ e.g. the rejection of a devoted bride for insufficiency, and a compelled marriage ordered by the ruler: the substitution of one woman for another: the false self-accusation of the chaste woman, followed by prolonged lying from the culprit, culminating in his exposure through the arrival of an absent person: the slanderer who speaks ill of his lord and is unmasked in public.

² William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure* (1566), contains as the xxxviii novel the story of 'Giletta a phisition's daughter of Narbon', the original being Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone*, III. ix. The subject of the relations of *All's Well* to its sources is, I understand, being considered in detail by Professor H. G. Wright.

people the whole story and goes away openly with a kinsman and a good deal of treasure. She reaches Florence, ferrets out Beltramo's mistress, plans the substitution and eventually gives birth to twin sons. At her leisure she returns, and entering on a day of feast, presents her two sons; Beltramo, to honour his word, and to please his subjects and the ladies, his guests who make suit to him, receives her as his wife.

These shrewd, unsentimental, vigorous Italians, who come to terms after a brisk skirmish, resemble Benedick and Beatrice rather than their own Shakespearian descendants. Two principal characters, the Countess and Parolles, have been added by Shakespeare, and two lesser ones, Lafeu and the Fool. The climaxes are heightened, and in the last scene Bertram is in danger of the law.¹ Shakespeare's hero is a very young man, highly conscious of his birth. He is handsome, courageous in battle, winning in manners: he is also an inveterate liar.

The Elizabethan code of honour supposed a gentleman to be absolutely incapable of a lie. In law his word without an oath was in some places held to be sufficient.² To give the lie was the deadliest of all insults and could not be wiped out except in blood. Honour was irretrievably lost only by lies or cowardice. These were more disgraceful than any crimes of violence. Alone among Shakespeare's heroes Bertram is guilty of the lie. Claudio, in *Much Ado*, is clear, and Bassanio, though he thinks of a lie to get himself out of an awkward situation at the end of the play, does not utter it. By such conduct Bertram forfeits his claims to gentility: a gentleman, as Touchstone remembered, swore by his troth, as a knight by his honour.³ For this he is shamed and rebuked openly, not only by his elders but by his contemporaries and even by his inferiors.⁴ The feelings of a modern audience towards Claudio or Bassanio may be due to a change in social standards, but Bertram is roundly condemned.

The fault, however, is not entirely his, for like Richard II, Prince Hal, and all other great ones in search of an excuse, he can shelter behind ill company. Parolles, or Wordy, a character of Shakespeare's own invention, is perceived in the end by Bertram himself to be the Lie incarnate. From the beginning the Countess had known him as

¹ Bertram's own lies cause this, and the exposure of his treatment of Diana. Her use in this scene is entirely Shakespeare's own invention, and much increases the melodrama. Helena in Act II also increases the tension by offering to have her name traduced as a strumpet if she fails to cure the King, and by cutting down the period required from eight days to two.

² R. Kelso, *The Doctrine of the English Gentleman* (Urbana, 1929), p. 78.

³ *As You Like It*, I. ii. Cf. Mulcaster, *Positions* (reprinted London, 1898), p. 198.

⁴ e.g. IV. ii. 11-30 where Diana, who is perhaps his social equal, being descended from the ancient Capilet, rebukes him; IV. iii. 1-30, where the young Lords criticize him. Parolles's sonnet contains some nasty home truths: in the last scene the King and Lafeu are quite uncompromising. Bertram's word is not to be trusted (V. iii. 184-6).

a verie tainted fellow, and full of wickednesse,
My sonne corrupts a well-derived nature
With his inducement

(III. ii. 90-2)

whilst Helena describes him before he appears as 'a notorious Liar', 'a great way foole, solie a coward'. It is not till the final scene that Bertram too acknowledges him

a most perfidious slave . . .

Whose nature sickens: but to speake a truth. (v. iii. 207-9)

In the earlier part of the play he is completely gulled by Parolles, who gains his ends by flattery. To the Elizabethan, the flatterer was the chief danger of noble youth, and his ways were exposed in most of the manuals of conduct. In Stefano Guazzo's *Civile Conversation*, a book of manners designed for the lesser nobility, much of Book II is taken up with the subject. Shakespeare in his comedy makes little use of the figure of the flatterer, and this differentiates him from Chapman, Jonson, and Middleton, who took the parasite of ancient comedy and furnished him with the latest tricks of the coney-catcher. Falstaff is in some sense a flatterer, but he is never more deceived than when he thinks to govern his sweet Hal.¹

Flattery thrives on detraction: and Parolles's evil speaking, which finally exposes him, has been anticipated by his double-dealing with Helena and Lafeu. His cowardice is of no power to infect Bertram, but his lying is contagious, and in the last scene the count shows how deeply he is tainted. The unmasking of Bertram re-echoes the unmasking of Parolles.

Shakespeare is unlikely to have felt deeply about the minutiae of social procedure, the punctilio of a modern and Frenchified fashion like the duel, or the niceties of address. Saviolo's discourse on the lie is put into the mouth of Touchstone, Segar's observations on Adam *armigero* are given to the First Gravedigger, and Falstaff has the longest if not the last word on Honour. But the question 'Wherein lies true honour and nobility?' was older than the new and fantastic codes of honour, or the new ideas of what constituted a gentleman. It is the theme of the first English secular drama, *Fulgens and Luces* (c. 1490), where Medwall gave the lady's verdict for the worthy commoner against the unworthy nobleman, thereby proving his independence of his original, Buonaccorso, who in *De Vere Nobilitate* had left the matter open. In 1525, Rastell, *Of Gentylnes & Nobylte*, treated the same subject, and it was an obvious theme for secular moralities. The question of blood and descent had been touched on by Shakespeare in *King John* in the triple contrast of Arthur, the legal successor, John the King *de facto*, and Richard the Bastard, whose royalty of nature makes him the natural leader. Civil nobility seen in relation to courtly life was a

¹ Hamlet's discrimination between Polonius, his two schoolfellows, and Osric is a mark of the wise prince: Timon's failure to discriminate is his downfall.

different aspect of the same problem and it is with this that Shakespeare is concerned in *All's Well*.

When at the turn of the fifteenth century, the ruling caste had ceased also to be a fighting caste, there remained for the elder and wiser the role of statesman or politician and for the younger sort that of courtier. The feudal tenant-in-chief had derived his standing from his military prowess and his local territorial responsibilities of delegated rule. Although the military profession was no longer paramount, the young noble was trained in war. The perfect courtier was required to be witty, full of counsel and of jests, skilled in music and poetry, a horseman, a patron of all noble science. Such arts of living could be learnt only at the court. He should be ambitious of honour—like Hotspur and Prince Hal—truthful and loyal, kindly and modest. His life was devoted to glory, and his reward was good fame. Such employments as the professions afforded—of which that of physician was held least worthy, as too close to the barber and the potecary—were the refuge of impoverished families and of younger sons. As the king was the fount of honour, the young noble's place was at court; but the vanity and corruption of court life were especially dangerous for the young. In actuality, the scramble for preferment was a dangerous game in which the player might lose his all.¹ Warnings against the court had been set forth in literature for more than a century. Spenser's *Colin Clout's Come Home Again* depicts both the glories and miseries of the court. A sick or ageing ruler left the courtiers exposed to all the natural dangers of the place without restraint. Such a situation is depicted at the beginning of *All's Well*. The metaphor of the sick king was always something more than a metaphor for Shakespeare. The Countess bids farewell to her 'unseason'd courtier' with open misgivings, and Helena, too, is openly afraid of the influence of the court on Bertram: Parolles's description is not inviting, and even the clown is not improved by it.² When the court is reached, all the virtuous characters turn out to be elderly. The King describes the perfect courtier in the person of Bertram's father, recalled to his mind by the young man's likeness (a resemblance already twice commented on):³

Youth, thou bear'st thy Father's face,
 Franke Nature rather curious then in hast
 Hath well compos'd thee: Thy Father's morall parts
 Maist thou inherit too. (1. ii. 18-21)

¹ See Lawrence Stone, 'The Anatomy of the Elizabethan Aristocracy', *Economic History Review*, xviii (1948).

² 1. i. 71, 80-2; 182-93, 224; III. ii. 13-29. See Kelso, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-2, for a comparison between the English and Italian courtly traditions, which suggests that English courtiers were more frequently employed in administration and that mere attendance at court was in England not considered an occupation in itself. Yet in spite of this, Sidney, like Bertram, stole away to the wars, though 'with a copy of Castiglione in his pocket'. ³ 1. i. 1, 71-2.

The elder Rousillon is but lately dead when the play opens. In an extensive picture or mirror of his father, the King sets up to Bertram that model which had already been recommended to him by his mother. It constitutes one of the main statements of the play, embodying the idea of true nobility.

He did look farre
 Into the service of the time, and was
 Discipled of the bravest . . . in his youth
 He had the wit, which I can well observe
 To day in our yong Lords: but they may iest
 Till their owne scorne returne to them unnoted
 Ere they can hide their levitie in honour:
 So like a Courtier, contempt nor bitterness
 Were in his pride, or sharpnesse; if they were,
 His equall had awak'd them, and his honour
 Clocke to it selfe, knew the true minute when
 Exception bid him speake: and at this time
 His tongue obeyd his hand. Who were below him,
 He us'd as creatures of another place,
 And bow'd his eminent top to their low rankes,
 Making them proud of his humilitie,
 In their poor praise he humbled. . . .

(1. ii. 26 ff.)

The model which Bertram actually takes is the very antithesis of this. Parolles claims to be both courtier and soldier, but his courtliness is entirely speech, as his soldiership is entirely dress. Even the clown calls Parolles knave and fool to his face (II. iv). He is ready to play the pander and to tempt Bertram ('a filthy Officer he is in those suggestions for the young Earle', III. v. 17-18), yet at the end he crawls to the protection of old Lafeu, who had been the first to meet with provocative insults the challenge of the 'counterfeit'.

Affability to inferiors was indeed not always recommended: Elyot held that courtesy consisted in giving every man his due, whilst Guazzo thought 'to be too popular and plausible, were to make largesse of the treasures of his courtesie, to abase himself, and to shew a sign of folly or flatterie'.¹ Yet on the other hand, Theseus's gracious kindness to the tradesmen, or Hamlet's sharp answer to Polonius's 'I will use them according to their desert'—

Gods bodykins, man better. Use everie man after his desert, and who should scape whipping: use them after your own Honor and Dignity. The lesse they deserve, the more merit is in your bountie

illustrate the same virtue which the King praised in the elder Rousillon.

The arts of speech were indeed in themselves the very stuff of which a

¹ S. Guazzo, translated by Pettie, *Civile Conversation* (reprinted London, 1925), i. 158.

courtier was made. Guazzo describes first of all the speech and bearing to be cultivated, and then the truthfulness, fair speaking, and modesty which should characterize the matter of discourse. Hence the ungraciousness of Bertram's petulance. 'A poore Physitian's daughter my wife?' did not perhaps sound quite so outrageous as it does now, for marriage out of one's degree was a debasing of the blood which blemished successive heirs. But Helena is of gentle, though not of noble blood, and all the other young nobles who have been offered to her have been ready to accept her.

The question that is raised by Bertram's pride and the King's act is one central to all discussion on the nature of nobility.

One standard commonplace on nobility took shape: that lineage alone was not enough, but that the son of a noble family should increase and not degrade the glory of his ancestors.¹

Aristotle had said that Nobility consisted in virtue and ancient riches:² Lord Burghley, a potent authority in his day, lopped the phrase down: 'Nobility is nothing but ancient riches.' Whilst it was admitted that the King could confer nobility upon anyone, gentility was sometimes held to be conferred only by descent; hence the saying, 'The King cannot make a gentleman.' At the court of Elizabeth, herself the granddaughter of a London citizen and surrounded by new nobility, the more rigid views were not likely to prevail. Nevertheless 'nobility native' was inevitably preferable to 'nobility dative'.³ Through inheritance it conferred a disposition to virtue, and even the degenerate were shielded in some manner by their descent, 'the fame and wealth of their ancestors serves to cover them as long as it can, as a thing once gilded, though it be copper within, till the gilt be worn away'.⁴ Education and the example of his ancestors would also help the nobleman, though a bad education might corrupt him entirely.⁵ The debate on old and new titles in Osorio's *Discourse of Civil and Christian Nobility* went in favour of blood, while Nenna's *Il Nennio* supported the lowly born. But all would agree with Mulcaster: 'The well-born and virtuous doth well deserve double honour among men . . . where desert for virtue is coupled with descent in blood'.⁶

Desert for virtue is Helena's claim, and the two words echo significantly throughout the play. The causes for ennobling the simple were headed by 'virtue public', i.e. some great public service, and this it is which ennobles

¹ John E. Mason, *Gentlefolk in the Making* (Philadelphia, 1935), p. 8.

² *Politics*, IV. viii. 9.

³ Kelso, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁴ Sir Thomas Smith, *De Repub. Anglorum* (reprinted London, 1906), p. 38.

⁵ Kelso, *op. cit.*, p. 24, quotes La Perrière, *Mirour of Policie* (translated 1598): 'If he be evilly instructed in his young years, he will as long as he liveth have such manners as are barbarous, strange, and full of villainy.' The education of a prince or noble was the subject of constant discussion.

⁶ Mulcaster, *Positions*, ed. cit., p. 199; quoted by Kelso, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

her. Learning and riches were other causes. Elyot declared that nobility is 'only the prayse and surname of virtue' and set forth the eleven moral virtues of Aristotle as the model for his Governor.¹ The essentially competitive nature of honour, while it was recognized, was not stressed.

In Helena and Bertram, the true and the false nobility are in contest. Helena seeks recognition: Bertram denies it. The King, with the Countess and Lafeu, whom Shakespeare created to act as arbiters, are all doubly ennobled by birth and virtue and therefore judge dispassionately. By these three judges the young people are compared at intervals throughout the play, to the increasing disadvantage of Bertram. In the first scene, the Countess introduces Helena as inheriting virtue and yet improving on it. The technical terms of honour emphasize her point:

I have those hopes of her good, that her education promises: her dispositions shee inherits, which makes faire gifts fairer . . . she derives her honestie, and atcheeves her goodnesse (I. i. 47 ff.).

Of Bertram she cherishes hopes less assured, but wishes that his blood and virtue may contend for precedence, and his goodness share with his birth-right.

By making his social climber a woman, Shakespeare took a good deal of the sting out of the situation. Helena's virtues were derived from her father and from heaven, to whose intervention she ascribes all her power to cure the King. She protests she is richest in being simply a maid, and the King offers her to Bertram with the words

Vertue and shee

Is her owne dower: Honour and wealth, from mee.

The promotion of a modest but dignified young woman is far from arousing jealousy.² Helena had been conscious of her lowliness and in her first soliloquy she almost despairs:

Twere all one,

That I should love a bright particuler starre,

And think to wed it, he is so above me.

(I. i. 97-9)

To the Countess, before making her confession, she says:

I am from humble, he from honored name:

No note upon my Parents, his all noble,

My Master, my deere Lorde he is, and I

His servant live, and will his vassall die. (I. iii. 164-7)

These words are not retracted by her confession for she protests that she does not follow him by any token of presumptuous suit: 'Nor would I

¹ *The Governor*, ed. Croft, ii. 38. Quoted by Mason, op. cit., p. 26.

² Her many hesitations, her disclaimer of any aspiration to a royal match, show Helena's decorum. No Elizabethan could, like a modern writer, have called it 'canny'.

have him till I doe deserve him' (I. iii. 199). At her first encounter with the King, Helena is almost driven off by her first rebuff. In stately couplets which mark out the solemnity of the moment she suddenly returns and offers herself as 'the weakest minister' of heaven. She frankly claims 'inspired Merit' and warns the King that it is presumption to think Heaven cannot work through the humble. 'Of heaven, not me, make an experiment.' The King recognizes the power of something greater than herself in Helena's voice and he submits. She is 'undoubted blest'.

Such claims shift the ground of Helena's nobility. To fail to recognize her as already ennobled in a superior way by the choice of heaven is an aggravation of Bertram's offence in refusing the consummation of the marriage—itsself a religious duty as Diana reminds him (IV. ii. 12-13). The Countess feels nothing but indignation with the 'rash and unbridled boy', for

the misprising of a Maide too vertuous
For the contempt of Empire. (III. ii. 27-8)

Even before the journey to court she had loved Helena as her own child (I. iii. 98, 143-4) and now she prefers her, disclaiming her proper son (III. ii. 68-9), who in rejecting such a wife has lost more honour than he can ever win with his sword. Helena's penitential pilgrimage raises her yet higher in the Countess's estimation, and finally, with the report of her death, she becomes 'the most vertuous gentlewoman, that ever Nature had praise for creating' (IV. v. 9-10).

In bestowing a wife on one of the royal wards, the King was certainly doing no more than Elizabeth and James had done. Much lesser persons regarded their wards as legitimate matrimonial prizes. The customary formula (which the King uses): 'Can you like of this man?' 'Can you like of this maid?' did not imply love but only the ability to live harmoniously together. Bertram, who is succinctly described by Lafeu as an 'asse', has, it is clear from the first scene, no dislike to Helena, but he knows her as his mother's servant and 'I cannot *love* her, nor will strive to doo't'. Only later does the brilliant idea occur to him that he was really in love with Lafeu's daughter.¹ His seduction of Diana 'contrives against his owne Nobilitie', and his responsibility for the death of Helena means that 'the great dignitie that his valour hath here acquir'd for him (i.e. in Florence), shal at home be encountered with a shame as ample' (IV. iii. 25-30, 79-82).

Bertram's 'folly', though excused as the fault of Parolles's ill counsel (IV. ii. 1), and as 'Naturall rebellion, done i' th blaze of youth' (V. iii. 6), remains in the eyes of Lafeu a blot upon his honour. However much

¹ The King had long ago arranged the match, in the young people's childhood, and Bertram's affection may be assumed to be politic; but his readiness to accept the plan undermines his claim to freedom of choice in his first marriage.

Bertram wronged his King, his mother, and his wife, he wronged himself much more (v. iii. 12-19). Lafeu champions Helena's memory rather in the way in which Paulina champions Hermione's, and the rapidity with which the King jumps to thoughts of murder when he sees the royal gem offered as 'an amorous token for fair *Maudlin*' is a proof of his feeling for Helena no less than of his well-merited distrust of Bertram. Like the rings of Bassanio and Portia, the jewels which are bandied about in the last scene are symbolic of a contract and an estate of life. The King's gem derived from him to Helena, and Bertram neither knows nor cares what it is. His own monumental ring symbolizes all that he has thrown away:¹

an honour longing to our house,
Bequeathed downe from manie Ancestors,
Which were the greatest obloquie i' th world,
In me to loose.

(iv. ii. 42-5)

This jewel, with which he had taunted Helena, is found at the end in her keeping.

Nevertheless, though Helena is wise and Bertram foolish, though she is humble and he is proud, his final acknowledgement of her would constitute a strong ending. When Brachiano marries Vittoria, or when in *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, Sir Francis marries Susan, the condescension of the noble partner is matter for astonishment. Even in realistic comedy, such as *Eastward Ho!*, the marriage of court and city provides grounds for satire and for farce. Helena's success would lose all point if it were not a great exception. If this suggests that social theory enabled the judicious spectator both to eat his cake and have it, the answer is that the same dilemma lies at the centre of the play, and is expounded by the king in a full account of the nature of title and dignity—a speech which had tradition behind it, but which is sharply at variance with the niggers who measured whether honour came with the first or third generation of a new title.

Tis onely title thou disdainst in her, the which
I can build up: strange is it that our bloods
Of colour, waight and heat, pour'd all together,
Would quite confound distinction: yet stands off
In differences so mightie. If she bee
All that is vertuous (save what thou dislikst),
A poore Phisitian's daughter, thou dislikst
Of vertue for the name: but doe not so:
From lowest place, whence vertuous things proceed,
The place is dignified by th' doers' deede.

¹ In Painter's story the ring is not an heirloom, but prized by Beltramo 'for a certain vertue that he knew it had'. Bertram's use of Diana's ring as a love-token should not be pressed as a point against him, though it is hardly suitable: but his lying repudiation and slander of Diana is ignoble.

When great additions swells, and vertue none,
 It is a dropsied honour. Good alone,
 Is good without a name. Vilenesse is so:
 The propertie by what it is, should go,
 Not by the title. She is young, wise, faire,
 In these, to Nature shee's immediate heire:
 And these breed honour: that is honour's scorne,
 Which challenges it selfe as honour's borne,
 And is not like the sire: Honours thrive
 When rather from our acts we them derive
 Then our fore-goers: the meere words, a slave
 Deboshed on everie tombe, on everie grave:
 A lying Trophee, and as ofte is dumbe,
 Where dust, and damn'd oblivion is the Tombe
 Of honour'd bones indeed. . . . (II. iii. 124 ff.)

Helena already possesses the essential attributes and therefore the potentiality of honour, which the King by his recognition of her claims will bestow. 'The name and not the thing' is vanity.¹

Medieval tradition recognized three classes of nobility:² Christian, natural, and civil. Pre-eminence must be given to sanctity, but the saints included poor fishers, even slaves. Natural nobility or perfection of kind might be ascribed to animals, and a noble falcon justly so termed. The writers of books of honour often mentioned these two classes but pointed out that they could not discuss them. One of the fullest treatments of the subject is by Dante in his *Convivio*. He denies civil nobility any real value.³ Nobility, he says, cannot be defined by riches, which in themselves are vile,⁴ or by time, because all men ultimately derive from a common stock, but only by its effects. The necessary outcome or effect of Nobility is Virtue: where Virtue exists, Nobility must therefore exist as its cause. Nobility descends upon an individual by the grace of God (*Convivio*, IV. xv) and is 'the seed of blessedness dropped by God into a rightly placed soul'. Dante goes on to expound the eleven moral virtues (much like Elyot). The claim to nobility by descent is then refuted, natural and Christian nobility identified, and civil nobility wiped out. Dante's Third Ode, upon which this section of the *Convivio* provides a commentary, is addressed to Beatrice, who, like Helena, is an example of active virtue, received by a direct infusion of grace. The language of religion is used with particular frequency

¹ So, when she has fulfilled Bertram's conditions, Helena turns to seek, not her lord, but the King (IV. iv), because public recognition of her right is essential.

² Kelso, *op. cit.*, p. 21, where it is mentioned that later writers tended to ignore these divisions, or to pay them lip-service only.

³ *Convivio*, Fourth Treatise.

⁴ *Nobile* is derived by Dante from *not vile* (IV. xvi).

by Shakespeare in this play,¹ and the gravest words of all are spoken by the Clown (iv. v. 50-9) when he describes how 'the Prince of this world' entices nobility 'into his court'.

I am for the house with the narrow gate, which I take to be too little for pompe to enter: some that humble themselves may, but the manie will be too chill and tender, and theyll bee for the flowrie way that leads to the broad gate, and the great fire.

Helena is 'a Jewell' (v. iii. 1) which Bertram throws away. His rejection of her must be seen not in isolation but as linked with his choice of Parolles.² The first dialogue of Helena and Parolles, the Liar and Vertue as she herself has labelled them, must be seen as the encounter of Bertram's good and evil angels, who, if this were a morality, would contend for his soul in open debate.³ In the final scene Parolles turns the tables on Bertram, and though the King dismisses the informer with contempt, an elaborate and inexorable shaming of the now utterly silenced young man proceeds. This last scene, in which Shakespeare completely forsakes his original, has the closest affinities with *Measure for Measure*. It is a judgement scene with charge and countercharge piled up in bewildering contradiction till they are resolved as if by miracle in the sudden appearance of the central figure. In this scene the King appears as the fount of justice: he deprives Bertram of all honour (v. iii. 184-6), though the revenges with which he threatens the young man should not be taken in any personal sense. Such a finale, with a royal judgement, and a distribution of rewards and punishments, was a well-established comic convention,⁴ though it is difficult to resist the thought that in offering Diana a husband, the King shows some inability to profit by experience. The riddles with which Diana led up to the dénouement recall those in which Portia swore she lay with Doctor Balthazar to obtain the ring, and they are not to modern taste.

Bertram's conversion must be reckoned among Helena's miracles. What is well ended is her struggle for recognition, which he concedes her. Her devotion, tinged for the first time with bitterness, requires another mode of expression than the last dozen lines allow. She has been acknowledged by her lord: that her personal happiness is simply irrelevant, and the ending therefore neither hypocritical nor cynical, can be granted only if the play is seen as a study of the question of 'Wherein lies true honour and nobility?'

¹ e.g. I. i. 109-10, 239-40; I. ii. 57-8, 65-7; I. iii. 20-1, 212-13, 253; II. i. 139-44, 151-7, 163, 178-9; II. iii. 1-7, 28-9, 69; III. iv. 28-9; IV. ii. 21-9, 66-8; IV. iii. 55-63.

² The pride of Parolles and the humility of Helena have been contrasted in their use of the term 'master': they are shown at the beginning as more or less social equals.

³ Bertram's ultimate rejection of Parolles, though well deserved, is expressed with a wilful petulance, not with shame: 'I could endure anything but a Cat, and now he's a Cat to me' (IV. iii. 242-3).

⁴ e.g. *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, *An Humorous Day's Mirth*.

LEONTES A JEALOUS TYRANT

By PAUL N. SIEGEL

I

W. A. ARMSTRONG has admirably shown¹ how Elizabethan dramatists used the contemporary concept of the tyrant to develop a genre which he has named the tyrant-tragedy. 'Like overweening Satan', he sums up,

the usurping tyrant is inevitably punished, for the Elizabethan treatment of his career follows a strict pattern of elaborate poetic justice. Inwardly, he is tortured by his vicious passions and his censorious conscience; outwardly, he walks in incessant fear and suspicion; his life is short, his death sudden and violent; and hereafter he must expect only the tortures of the damned. The usurping tyrant who kills a king to gratify the passion of ambition is guilty of a sacrilegious attack upon the hierarchy of order and degree instituted by natural law, and his awful fate is a punishment eminently just.²

Armstrong's description of the tyrant-tragedy enlarges our understanding and appreciation of *Richard III* and *Macbeth*. However, in analysing the use of the Elizabethan concept of the tyrant in this dramatic genre, he has failed to show this concept in all its fullness and has ignored another Shakespearian drama of a tyrant. Leontes in *The Winter's Tale* is proclaimed to be a tyrant by the oracle of Apollo, as Richard and Macbeth are proclaimed to be tyrants by Richmond and Malcolm, who are presented as the ministers of God.³ In each play the divine proclamation is a climax and a turning-point which follows immediately after the worst of the tyrant's crimes. For, although these three tyrants, whom Shakespeare drew in different stages of his career, differ widely in character, the nature of their tyranny, as we shall see, is the same, and the plays in which they appear display, with significant variations, the same basic pattern as their tyranny works itself out.

¹ W. A. Armstrong, 'The Elizabethan Concept of the Tyrant', *R.E.S.* xxii (1946), pp. 161-81, and 'The Influence of Seneca and Machiavelli on the Elizabethan Tyrant', *R.E.S.* xxiv (1948), pp. 19-35.

² 'The Influence of Seneca and Machiavelli on the Elizabethan Tyrant', loc. cit., p. 19.

³ Margaret calls Edward IV a tyrant (3 *Henry VI*, III. iii. 71-2) and the Roman populace repeats the charge made by the conspirators that Caesar was a tyrant (*Julius Caesar*, III. i. 78; III. ii. 74), but these accusations are presented as an indication of that proneness of men to be misled into rebellion by the blindness of their emotions or the frailty of their judgements of which the 1571 homily against disobedience had warned.

II

What Leontes has in common with Richard and Macbeth is that, although his master-passion of jealousy differs from theirs, each is completely dominated by it. This subjection of reason to passion was, in the Elizabethan view, what made a monarch a tyrant. 'We are no tyrant', affirms Shakespeare's Henry V, 'but a Christian king, Unto whose grace our passion is as subject As is our wretches fett' red in our prisons.'¹ As an ideal king he is well aware that the ability to control his own passions is the mark of the true ruler of men, and that the failure to do so is the mark of the tyrant, who, in letting loose the forces of disorder within himself, causes them to sweep over the entire kingdom.

This concept of the tyrant is part of the entire Elizabethan ideology, in which society is an integrated hierarchy that reflects the cosmological order and the psychological nature of man. In this ideology the rule of a good prince resembles the rule of reason over the passions in a man of well-balanced personality, and human society and man's inner nature are only parts of the harmonious order of the universe.² The prince, who by birth and breeding excels the rest of mankind, has it as his duty to fashion a virtuous and harmonious society after his own image.³ The tyrant, however, unable to rule himself, is unable to rule others.⁴ For such a man princely power acts as a rich soil which causes his passions to come to a monstrous growth, spreading 'greedy desire, pride, wrath, solemnnesse, and such tyrannicall fashions . . .'.⁵ Unlike the good prince, who thinks only of his people, he thinks only of himself.⁶ The result is the ruination of the social order, for 'when they wych haue rule, corrupt wyth ambycyon, enuy, or malyce, or any other affecte, loke only to theyr owne syngular wele, plesure, and profyt, then thys gude ordur ys turnyd into hye tyannye; then ys broken the rule of al gud cyuylyte'.⁷ As the tyrant gives free rein to his passions, he indulges in greater and greater crimes, disregarding the laws of God. Because of his position at the centre of society, his own inner disturbance has ever-widening repercussions till it agitates

¹ *Henry V*, I. ii. 241-3. The spectators of the popular drama were, of course, familiar with the biblical Herod as a ranting, tempestuous tyrant who would 'tear a passion to tatters' (*Hamlet*, III. ii. 10). Even Bottom knew that the tyrant must roar and rage: 'My chief humour is for a tyrant: I could play Ercles rarely, or a part to tear a cat in, to make all split' (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, I. ii. 23-4).

² Cf. Erasmus, *The Education of a Christian Prince* (New York, 1936), p. 175; Elyot, *The Boke Named the Governour*, ed. H. H. S. Croft (London, 1883), I. 4-6; Baldassare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, tr. Sir Thomas Hoby (1561) (London, 1928), pp. 275-7.

³ Erasmus, p. 157; Castiglione, pp. 276-7.

⁴ Thomas Starkey, *A Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset*, ed. J. M. Cowper, E.E.T.S. (1878), ext. ser., pp. 3-4.

⁵ Castiglione, p. 278.

⁶ Erasmus, p. 163; Castiglione, p. 278.

⁷ Starkey, pp. 53-4.

the entire land.¹ Thus, like the good prince, he fashions his kingdom in his own image.² Lacking emotional balance,³ he promotes social disorder; violating the natural laws prescribed by the human conscience, he destroys the social relations prescribed by man's nature.

III

The Winter's Tale grows in scope when we realize that Leontes is not merely a jealous man, as he is represented by so many Shakespearian critics, but a king whose inflamed passions must finally make him dash the social order to pieces in his frenzy. As Leontes's jealousy blinds his judgement more and more, his deeds become more and more rash.

He begins by instructing Camillo to poison Polixenes in a scene typical of tyrant-tragedies, 'the Senecan debate-scene between passionate king and virtuous subject'.⁴ The good, wise counsellor, unable to dissuade Leontes from the heinous crime of regicide and knowing that of 'thousands that had struck anointed kings'⁵ all had come to bad ends, chooses the proper course of flying to exile rather than of obeying his sovereign. In doing so he is heeding not only the arguments for flight from tyranny of the Protestant Marian exiles but the official Tudor doctrine that, although subjects may not resist their sovereign, if anyone is ordered by him to do acts contrary to God's commandments he should disobey⁶—a doctrine to which Clarence refers in his plea to the murderers not to kill him, even though they say that they do so by orders of the king.⁷ Leontes, 'in rebellion with himself', says Camillo, 'will have All that are his so too'.⁸ Leontes's inner turmoil, which causes him to disobey the divine law of which he is the representative, must spread throughout the kingdom.

At this stage, however, he assures Camillo that he will give no blemish to his queen's honour lest the legitimacy of his son be questioned. But at

¹ Erasmus, p. 176.

² Erasmus, pp. 156-7.

³ Cf. *A Mirror for Magistrates*, ed. L. B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938), p. 371: 'Seyng than that kyng Rychard [III] never kept measure in any of his doings, seing also that he speaketh in Hel, whereat is no order . . . it is not meete that so disorderly and vnnatural a man as kyng Rychard was, shuld observe any metrical order in his talke.' Shakespeare's Richard III may seem, in his Machiavellianism, to be the complete master of himself, but, as his mother reviews his life, we see that it has been dominated by passion and that even the cool calculation of his middle age has been a servant of his master-passion:

Tetchy and wayward was thy infancy;
Thy school-days frightful, desp'rate, wild, and furious,
Thy prime of manhood daring, bold, and venturous,
Thy age confirm'd proud, subtle, sly, and bloody,
More mild, but yet more harmful, kind in hatred. (iv. iv. 168-72)

⁴ Armstrong, 'The Influence of Seneca and Machiavelli on the Elizabethan Tyrant', loc. cit., p. 35.

⁵ I. ii. 358.

⁶ 'An Exhortation to Obedience' (1547), *Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed To Be Read in Churches in the Time of the Late Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford, 1832), p. 110.

⁷ *Richard III*, I. iv. 200-5.

⁸ I. ii. 355-6.

the news of Polixenes's escape he is so incensed that he charges her in front of his court with adultery. He is no longer thinking of the welfare of his people but of his own fancied grievances. Yet even now he shows some restraint, realizing that the destruction of the dignity of the queen means the destruction of the social order (at the time of the trial he is no longer able to recognize this and has her 'on every post Proclaimed a strumpet'):¹

O thou thing!

Which I'll not call a creature of thy place,
Lest barbarism, making me the precedent,
Should a like language use to all degrees,
And mannerly distinguishment leave out
Betwixt the prince and beggar.²

Although he refuses to listen to the advice of his lords, saying, 'Our prerogative Calls not your councils',³ he agrees to consult the oracle.

When Hermione has been imprisoned, however, his brooding over her supposed guilt prevents him from sleeping and he plans to have her put to death, convinced, as tyrants are, that new and greater crimes will restore his slumber: 'Say that she were gone, Given to the fire, a moiety of my rest Might come to me again.'⁴ Just as he has made this resolution, Paulina enters with the new-born child and by her forthright but tactless advocacy of the queen's cause rouses his fury to a high pitch. In her interchange with him she calls him a traitor to himself, 'for he The sacred honour of himself, his queen's, His hopeful son's, his babe's, betrays to slander, Whose sting is sharper than the sword's'.⁵ When Leontes exclaims, 'I'll ha' thee burnt', she retorts, 'I care not; It is an heretic that makes the fire, Not she which burns in't'.⁶ In opposing Leontes, she is not being disloyal to the king and disobedient to the God who had appointed him, for it is Leontes who has departed from the ways of God. Although she will not call him a tyrant, she tells him, his conduct 'savours Of tyranny'.⁷ But now his rage passes all bounds, and he orders the infant to be left exposed in the desert. He has no sooner given this order than, as if in answer, comes the news that the message of the oracle has arrived. For this command that the infant be left to die, like Richard's murder of the young princes and Macbeth's murder of Macduff's children, is the culminating act which confirms him as a tyrant and brings forth divine intervention.

¹ III. ii. 102-3.

² II. i. 82-7.

³ II. i. 163-4.

⁴ II. iii. 7-9. Cf. Erasmus, p. 163, and Castiglione, p. 278. So, too, Richard and Macbeth, restless and sleepless, pile crime on crime; but this, far from giving them peace of mind, brings unrest and sleeplessness to the entire country.

⁵ II. iii. 83-6.

⁶ II. iii. 114-16.

⁷ II. iii. 119-20.

The trial-scene which follows is a dramatization of the solemnity of the issues involved. Hermione is accused not merely of adultery but of high treason. It is not only she who is in reality on trial, however, but Leontes, as he himself is aware. 'Let us be clear'd Of being tyrannous', he says, 'since we so openly proceed in justice.'¹ Hermione, however, charges that this justice is an empty formality hiding Leontes's arbitrary will and appeals from it to the justice of Apollo. The voice of Apollo, speaking through the oracle, answers her plea by proclaiming her to be chaste and Leontes to be a jealous tyrant. When Leontes sacrilegiously denies the divine judgement and wishes to continue with his own sham judicial proceedings, he is immediately stricken by the news of the death of his son, which confirms the oracle's words, 'The King shall live without an heir, if that which is lost be not found'.² Leontes has thus endangered the welfare of the state by rendering the succession in doubt. It is, however, a danger which is dispelled by the miracle of the recovery of Perdita, brought about by Leontes's contrition and sixteen-year penance. The secret purposes of the gods, working themselves out, prove to be good, for Leontes's 'saint-like sorrow'³ redeems his tyrannical actions.

Like Richard III and Macbeth, Leontes suffers retribution after he has been proclaimed to be a tyrant by a divine agency, but this retribution, the death of his son, acts as a shock to bring him back to normality after his fit of jealousy, and the loss of his son is more than made up for by the recovery of his wife and the recovery and happy marriage of his daughter. The tyrant's passion in this tragi-comedy does not create an ever-widening disorder in which the tyrant himself is finally engulfed; it only threatens to do so before it is miraculously brought under control as unexpectedly as it was unleashed. Leontes's jealousy is like an attack of insanity upon a gracious sovereign who has ruled over a well-ordered court as does a father over a happy family. The sole explanation for it is furnished by his intended victim, Polixenes: 'This jealousy is for a precious creature. As she's rare, Must it be great; and as his person's mighty, Must it be violent.'⁴ The remark acts as something of an excuse for Leontes's behaviour, preventing him from losing the audience's complete sympathy: a king, greater in every way than other men, it is implied, has more occasion and capacity for intense feeling than they. He is, in effect, a magnification of ordinary humanity, for, if his powers of reason are superior, his judgement is threatened by his greater intensity of emotion. Leontes's jealousy

¹ III. ii. 4-6. The true prince imitates God in his impartial justice tempered by mercy. His laws are grounded upon the natural law of God, the elementary principles of justice which God has written in the hearts of all men to be perceived by their unaided reason, and he himself obeys them. See Erasmus, pp. 158 and 221; Castiglione, pp. 276-7; and Starkey, p. 19.

² III. ii. 136-8.

³ V. i. 2.

⁴ I. ii. 451-4.

exemplifies the inherent presence of disorderly elements in human nature. It is not realistically motivated, for the play is intended to have the simple, elemental quality of the folk-story, with its lack of psychological realism, its ready acceptance of the presence of evil, and its awed wonder at the miraculous victory of good. It is a 'winter's tale' which might be told over a peasant hearth, of surface improbability but legendary significance.

IV

Shakespeare's depiction of the tyrant changed, as the part which evil played in his representation of life changed. In *Richard III* he saw evil as something external to ordinary humanity, and Richard is an inhuman monster. In *Macbeth* he saw evil as mysteriously present in all of us, ready at all times, given the favourable circumstances and the relaxation of our will, to drag us down to our doom, and Macbeth is a man of many good qualities who loses himself irretrievably in moral darkness. In *The Winter's Tale* he saw evil as inexplicable, a part of the order of things which must be accepted, for from it comes untold good, and Leontes is a serene, exalted figure suddenly caught up in a storm, only to emerge into greater brightness and sunshine. But, although the part which evil played in Shakespeare's vision of life changed, its nature was always the same, for in Shakespeare's Tudor humanist ideology evil was disorder and chaos in human nature, in society, in the universe. Although Leontes differs greatly from Richard III and Macbeth, his tyranny is the same disrupting force, and *The Winter's Tale* repeats, in a different key, the theme of the tyrant's inner discord reverberating throughout his kingdom, his violation of the law of God, his growth in crime rising to the crescendo of what Shakespeare makes the symbol for complete wickedness: the command to murder a child.¹

¹ King John, who of all Shakespeare's other kings comes closest to being a tyrant, orders Hubert to kill young Arthur, but the order is not carried out, and he repents of it before he hears that it has not been executed. The nobles, eager to revolt, seize upon the suspicious circumstances of Arthur's accidental death to blame John for it, but Faulconbridge, the representative of the national spirit, aware of the seriousness of the charge, properly gives him the benefit of the doubt.

FULKE GREVILLE'S DRAMATIC CHARACTERS

By PETER URE

Their conscience fir'd, who doe from God rebell,
Hell first is plac'd in them, then they in Hell.

SIR WILLIAM ALEXANDER, *Doomes-Day*: the first Houre.

I

THE work of the Elizabethan French Senecans is 'coterie literature', and Fulke Greville may well be a bat flying in the twilight between *The Spanish Tragedie* and *Hamlet*. But coterie literature may explore very thoroughly the minutiae of human conflict, while its closely woven texture sometimes demands painfully precise analysis. Since Professor Croll remarked: 'There is probably no play in the language in which it is harder to understand continuously what happens than *Alaham*';¹ it cannot be said that either *Alaham* or *Mustapha* have been subjected to the continuous understanding that they deserve. A recent judgement that Greville's plays are 'really rhymed political treatises'² may take its origin from Greville's own remark in the *Life of Sidney* that his purpose in his tragedies was to 'trace out the high waies of ambitious Governors, and to shew in the practice that the more audacity, advantage, and good successe such Sovereignties have, the more they hasten to their owne desolation and ruine'.³ But Greville has done himself an injustice if this well-known passage has led some critics to take too simple a view of his dramatic methods—although Greville did go on to declare that the arguments of his tragedies were not 'naked, and casuall' but 'nearer Level'd to . . . humours, counceils, and practices'. The subtlety and skill with which Greville levels to humours require, to be fully valued, a closer examination of the plays' textures than can be given here. For his own action in separating his overgrown Choruses from the plays for which they were originally intended shows that he was aware of the differences between a play and a rhymed political treatise. Although Greville rejected the 'strangeness or perplexedness of witty Fictions', he did not reject *ποσειδων*. His business is to explore the 'unbound, raging, infinite Thought-fire'⁴ of his *personae*. He is pre-eminently the dramatist of the 'inward man' and the correlator of the 'inward discord' with the 'outward wayes'.

¹ M. W. Croll, *The Works of Fulke Greville* (Philadelphia, 1903), p. 40.

² Laurence Michel, *The Tragedy of Philotas* (New Haven, 1949), p. 10.

³ *The Works of Fulke Greville*, ed. Grosart (Printed for Private Circulation, 1870), iv. 220.

⁴ *Alaham*, v. iv. 26. All references to Greville's plays are to *Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke*, ed. Geoffrey Bullough (Edinburgh and London, 1939), ii.

The emphasis on the inward man was a modification of what Schücking has named the 'baroque character' of the Elizabethan tragic hero. It is the difference between Marston's Antonio and Kyd's Hieronymo on the one hand, unpacking their hearts with words and frantic gesture, and Chapman's Senecal man on the other. Marston's own Gelloso in *Sophonisba*, who eschews what he calls 'a stage-like passion and weake heat', and the conduct of the other characters in the same play, illustrate in the work of a single dramatist the contemporary change in method from the baroque to the Senecal.¹ In Chapman and Marston one of the agents that helps to effect the change is neo-Stoicism: both evil and good have become inward matters—'our evil is not extrinsecall, it is within us, and settled in our intrailes'² and (in Lodge's significant mistranslation of Seneca's 'Bonus vero sine deo nemo est') 'There is no good man but hath a God within him'. It is not surprising that the neo-Stoic man weeps, like Marston's Massinissa, 'private deep inward drops of blood' in silence and secret anguish.³ It is part of Chapman's purpose in some of his tragedies to describe what happens when man, so conceived, comes into contact with the outward world and corrupt society. This is the theme of *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*; it is Byron's tragedy, too, that he has made the error of 'building himself outward', and has trusted his blood in others' veins.⁴ As presented by Chapman, Pompey's story in his *Caesar and Pompey* is also that of a man who forsakes his own 'God-inspir'd insight' and disregards Cato's warning that greatness which is not the product of an inward order is doomed to fall, but who later recovers his neo-Stoic balance with the resolution that he will 'build all inward'.⁵ The philosophy of Chapman's poems frequently exploits the contrast between the inward order and the outward ways.⁶

Chapman's awareness of the inward man is analogous to Fulke Greville's; but where Chapman tends to grasp the harsh dichotomy in its simpler

¹ See my 'John Marston's *Sophonisba*: a Reconsideration', *Durham University Journal*, new series, x (1949).

² Seneca, *Workes* . . . translated by T. Lodge (London, 1620), p. 242. ('Non est extrinsecum malum nostrum: intra nos est, in visceribus', Loeb Seneca, ed. Gummere, i. 332).

³ *Sophonisba*, III. ii, *Plays of John Marston*, ed. H. H. Wood (Edinburgh and London, 1938), II. 40.

⁴ *The Conspiracy of Byron*, I. ii. 140 in *The Tragedies of George Chapman*, ed. Parrott (London, 1910), p. 164.

⁵ *Caesar and Pompey*, v. i. 203 in *ibid.*, p. 392.

⁶ See, for example, in *The Poems of George Chapman*, ed. Bartlett (New York, 1941): 'To the High Borne Prince of Men Henrie . . .', ll. 4-5; 'To . . . Robert, Earle of Somerset', first prose passage, ll. 1-9; *Euthymiae Raptus*, 8-14, 36-7; *Eugenia*, 638-43, 810-11; 'A Hymne to our Saviour', 41-3, 265-7; 'To the Viscount . . . Rochester', 2-4; 'To yong imaginaries in knowledge', 5-9; 'To live with little', 47-8; 'Virgils Epigram of a good man', 9-10; 'A great man', 38-46.

forms, Greville is more alive to the disconcerting antinomies that arise from it. Chapman's attitude is inspired by his neo-Stoicism. Croll writes:

The kind of truth that the Stoics chiefly had in mind was moral and inward. It was a reality not visible to the eye, but veiled from common observation; hidden in a shrine toward which one might win his way, through a jostling, noisy mob of illusory appearances. . . . It is . . . possible to depict the effort of the athletic and disciplined mind in its progress toward the unattainable goal. And this effort of the mind was the characteristic theme of the Stoics, and the object of their rhetorical art.¹

Greville, too, turns inward in a way that is characteristic of the contemporary mood, and serves to show his affinities with Chapman. But while the inspiration of neo-Stoicism is central to Chapman, Greville tends, at least in the works in which he overtly speculates on the nature of man, towards a repudiation of the theory of human nature which lay at the basis of Chapman's ethic. Chapman's *Eugenia*, which is almost a treatise on the life of sound religion in the guise of an Epicede on the death of Lord Russell, exhibits a temper different from that of Greville's 'Treatise of Religion'.² Although Greville's description of the true religious life (stanzas 64-7) resembles Chapman's (ll. 471-84), Greville's writing is filled with precise theological implications (and terminology) that are quite foreign to Chapman's; and while Chapman emphasizes the correspondence between God and man's soul (ll. 423-30) and the 'Analogia Mundi & Corporis Principium partium' (ll. 721-45), Greville declares that any hope, such as is implied in Chapman's lines, that man might 'in flesh and blood Grow happily adorers of the Good' is checked by 'natural corruption' (stanzas 12-13). In phrases which he borrowed from Plutarch's *Moralia*,³ Chapman celebrates the *stabilis animi sedes* (ll. 678 ff.). It is this very doctrine of *εὐθυμία* that Greville chooses to attack, the 'heathen virtue', as he names it,

Where sublime Religion seems to refine
Affection, perturbation, every thought
Unto a *Mens Adepta*.

The powerful stanzas that follow set out Greville's case against the ethic of neo-Stoicism and use the characteristic antithesis:

For in this work, man still rests slave to Fame,
To inward caution, outward form and pride,
With curious watch to guard a rotten frame
Safe undiscover'd from the piercing ey'd,

¹ M. W. Croll, "Attic Prose" in the Seventeenth Century', *S.P.*, xviii (1921), 112-13.

² References are to the texts in Bertlett, ed. cit., and in *The Works of Fulke Greville*, ed. Grosart (1870), i.

³ See F. L. Schoell, *Études sur l'Humanisme Continental* (Paris, 1926), p. 241.

Assidious Caution tyrannizing there,
To make frail thoughts seem other then they are.

Under this mask, besides, no vice is dead,
But Passion with her counter-passion peaz'd;
The evil with it self both starv'd and fed,
And in her woes with her vain glories eas'd;
The work and tools alike, vain flesh and blood,
The labour great, the harvest never good.¹

Greville and Alexander were perhaps the only French Senecans so conscious of the rubble in the Stoic bastion; the awareness accounts for the difference in Greville's plays of his treatment of the 'unbound, raging, infinite Thought-fire' from that of Chapman or Daniel. For Calvinism was much more than a variant on Stoicism, although the *De Clementia* may have shown Calvin the way. Calvin could re-state the Lutheran *imperium spirituale*, the 'striving for inward freedom and independence of the world' which has been claimed as characteristic of Christianity in all ages,² in terms which made for a *rapprochement* of the Christian to the Stoic ethic; for the Stoics, too, had declared that virtue was a state of mind in their attempt to supersede an antique system of taboo,³ just as the Lutherans attempted to replace *χαρισματα* and 'outward holiness'⁴ with 'outward decency . . . [and] . . . inward spiritual righteousness'.⁵ But the *Institutio* stresses other aspects of the system which make any easy synthesis that may—by the author of *Eugenia* or by others—be effected between Reformation thought and Stoic ethics not applicable to Calvin's share in the rediscovery of the inward man. It is these aspects that compel Greville's poetic imagination, throughout 'Of Religion' and the later *Caelica* sonnets especially. If redressing the balance of Aquinas with Augustine meant to some Reformation neo-Stoics discovery of the 'God within', *deum in corpore humano hospitantem* of Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus, it was another God whom Calvin found dwelling within us on the evidence of the continual working of his power.⁶ Calvin and Montaigne might both help to diffuse the psychological method,⁷ but while Montaigne emphasizes that 'study of his own inner strength and weakness' through which man can

¹ Grosart, ed. cit., i. 251.

² Heinrich Boehmer, *Luther* (London, 1930), p. 277.

³ E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism* (London, 1911), p. 287. Cf. R. D. Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean* (London, 1910), p. 92: 'The deepest thought of Stoic ethics is that virtuous or vicious life is not to be regarded as a sum of isolated virtuous or vicious actions, but as an inward unity governed by a single principle.'

⁴ The phrase is Boehmer's, op. cit., p. 284.

⁵ Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Edinburgh, 1845), i. 434.

⁶ Ibid. i. 75.

⁷ P. Villey, *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne* (Paris, 1933), i. 9.

learn to discover himself,¹ for Calvin the rediscovery of the 'labyrinthine' inward man is itself the immediate source of that 'variety of fictions', the 'immense crowd of [false] gods [that] have issued from the human mind'.² Realization of how excellent is the human person, 'a magazine stored with treasures of inestimable value' (which is not, however, the same phrase as 'a God within'), concludes in sinful pride,³ whenever human pollution is not measured against the refulgence of God.⁴ In Greville and Calvin another kind of false religion is born of superstitious Fear (which must be distinguished from voluntary reverence), issue of that inward weakness which cannot bear the contemplation of the divine majesty:

when Fear's dim eyes look in,
They guilt discern; when upwards, Justice there
Reflects self-horror back upon the sin. . . .

For Fear

Fashions God unto man, not man to God:
And to that deity, gives all without
Of which within it lives and dies in doubt.⁵

Fear and self-horror are consistently revealed in Greville's explorations of the inward man in *Mustapha* and *Alaham*; Chapman's confidence that 'As we are men, we death and hell controule' is in Greville negated by an awareness that 'flesh and blood' may itself become 'hell'.⁶ In *Caelica* and in the treatises on Fame and Learning this awareness gives the lie to the whole Stoic-Christian *rapprochement*, trailing after it a scepticism which in the dramas, since they are set in no Christian milieu, directs itself not towards fideism, but towards an investigation, at once savage and melancholy, into the 'diverse world', seen as 'a stage for blood-enamelled shoues'.⁷

Greville in his plays, therefore, shares the contemporary tendency to

¹ Douglas Bush, *The Renaissance and English Humanism* (New York, 1939), p. 93.

² Calvin, op. cit. i. 77. Cf. Greville, 'Of Religion', stanzas 16 ff. Greville here differs from Du-Plessis-Mornay (*Trewenes of the Christian Religion*, chap. iii) who calls upon antiquity to testify that, notwithstanding appearances, men have always been monotheists at heart [*Complete Works of Sir P. Sidney*, ed. Feuillerat (Cambridge, 1923), iii. 292-311]. Greville's religious temper seems generally different from that of Mornay: one suspects that the tendency to associate Greville with the Huguenot humanist is a matter of biography rather than of much intellectual kinship.

³ Calvin, op. cit. i. 68.

⁴ Ibid. i. 49.

⁵ 'Of Religion', stanzas 22-3. Cf. Calvin, op. cit. i. 59-63. For other reactions by Greville against classical humanism see 'An Inquisition upon Fame and Honour' (stanza 23: 'Within our selues, they seat Felicities') and also the passages cited by Professor Ellis-Fermor in her chapter on Greville in *Jacobean Drama* (London, 1937).

⁶ Compare Chapman, 'A Hymne to Christ', l. 200 and the Epictetan confidence of Clermont d'Ambois (*Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, III. iv. 66 ff.) with Greville, *Caelica*, cii (Bullough, ed. cit. i. 146).

⁷ *Alaham*, Cho. 3, 82.

look inward, but the entrails of his beings, when they are examined only in the strong light of his own faith, contain not a God but corruption, and are 'the ugly center of infernal spirits'.¹ Such examination is not always vouchsafed to them. For Greville the dramatist is too steeped in the affinities of his French Senecan form to the Senecal philosophy to be able to present a dramatic picture darkened by Calvinism to the degree that Chapman's is illuminated by Stoicism. We are conscious of a willingness to conform to certain dramatic methods which is irreconcilable with the rigorism displayed in 'Of Religion'. To these dramatic methods the looking inward and the correspondence between inward state and outward action are important. This fact suggests that current emphasis on the 'monarchal' aspects of his tragedies has sacrificed, for the sake of what is typical and documentary in his plays, that which is personal and valuable in them as a contribution to literature.²

II

Greville's dramaturgical exploitation of the rediscovery of the inward man may be stated as follows: his plays, and especially *Alaham*, contain together, and in unresolved conflict, both the neo-Stoic and the Calvinist idea of man's inward nature and its relationship to the outward world and God. Neo-Stoic and Calvinist views, when put in conjunction, may be represented thus: Inward, the neo-Stoic finds *nihil aliud quam deum hospitantem*, potential εἰδωμία (Chapman's 'inward peace'); the Calvinist finds corruption, the hell of flesh and blood, the 'ugly center' (Greville's 'inward discord', Calvin's shadow-producing 'labyrinth'). This corruption is qualified—and the qualification is responsible for blurring the distinction between the two systems—by man's own awareness of an apparent excel-

¹ *Caelica*, xcix. It is in *Caelica*, lxxxvi, c, ci, cii, cvi that we are most conscious of Greville's case against the heathen virtue in his handling of the inward-outward antithesis. A pleasant kind of Stoicism, but hardly one felt in the blood, is observable in parts of the Monarchy treatise and in the rather worldly treatment of the antithesis in 'A Letter to an Honourable Lady' (*Certain Learned and Elegant Workes*, 1633): 'My counsell is therefore Madame! that you enrich yourselfe upon your owne stocke, not looking outwardly, but inwardly for the fruit of true Peace, whose rootes are there' (p. 273, *et passim*). The tone of parts of the 'Letter' is that of Daniel's 'Epistle to the Countesse of Bedford', and even involves praise of the *Mens adepti*. For a 'normal' Stoic-Christian handling of the antithesis see also Joseph Hall, *Heaven upon Earth*, Sect. iii (a definition of Christian εἰδωμία), ed. Rudolf Kirk (New Jersey, 1948) with an interesting introduction on Hall's Christian neo-Stoicism.

² In any case, Greville's political views (which are unexciting) are best seen in the Monarchy treatise, and have been set out by M. Kuppfer, *Fulke Greville's Poems of Monarchy als Spiegel seiner politischen Ansichten* (Riga, 1929). Miss Kuppfer gives no explanation of Greville's obsession with the 'weak tyrant', as distinct from the danger of monarchy degenerating into tyranny—a commonplace of the *Politics* sharpened by Machiavellian *Angst*—and it does not seem to be reflected in writers like LeRoy, Hurault, or Grimaldus.

lence (when that is not compared to God's) and by the natural conviction of God's existence which man finds on examining his heart.¹ Outward, the neo-Stoic sees the corrupt Fortune-dominated world (Chapman's 'gaudy light', Greville's, Chapman's, and Daniel's 'Opinion');² for the Calvinist, too, the world is corrupt, but the aetiology of this corruption is not Stoic, for the world contains the false outward Church and the other shadows which man's inward corruption spins out of itself:

A play of Sunne-motes, from mans small World come,
Vpon the great World to worke heauy doome. (*Mustapha*, Cho. 2, 175-6.)

The Stoic *τύχη* is superseded by the idea of the Fall.

This is a diagrammatic statement of the antitheses, and consequently an over-simplified one. But it is the business of literature, and especially of drama, to be more complex than the most complicated diagrams. Greville's plays are built up from interactions between neo-Stoicism and Calvinism as complex as are the affinities of Calvin with Seneca and of the Reformation with the Renaissance of classicism. 'A Treatie of Humane Learning' and 'A Treatie of Warres' are created with the resultant paradoxes as their sustaining basis, so that it is always hard to say, in examining Greville's writings, where Calvinism retreats or compromises before a neo-Stoicism that is often itself but a mirror image of the *Institutio*. In the plays Greville's creation of character and situation is affected by this ambivalence, although, since his scenes are Turkish, the elimination of specifically Reformation ideas is compensated for by a tendency to weight the scales in favour of the view that fallen man (and Mohammedan man at that) can hardly escape from his ugly centre. By stressing the antinomies Greville compels his characters to live to themselves and to one another. Three kinds of approach to the plays may lend support to this view—a demonstration of how vital to the life of the characters is their consciousness of their inward potentialities and discords, some examples of the way the antitheses are made vivid in passages of dialogue (which may also show that such interchanges have vitality, although not of a kind acceptable on the stage), and an evaluation of Greville's treatment of the supernatural world. For Greville's interpretation of the powers of the supernatural is relevant to the distorted beings whom he portrays.

It is convenient to discuss *Alaham* first, although it may be substantially

¹ Mornay makes much of this conviction in his first chapter, op. cit., pp. 263 ff.

² The frequent use of this word with a special pejorative meaning in these writers derives from the Stoic belief that 'Opinion' (*δόξα* or, in Epictetus, *Discourses*, Loeb ed., II. xi. 13, *ἀνόγητος*) is 'unworthy of the sage' (Hicks, op. cit., p. 69). Cf. also the signification of the word as used by Jonson in *Hymenaei* and *Discoveries* (Oxford Jonson, viii. 564), Charron, *De la Sagesse* (Paris, 1836), p. 80, Guilpin, *Skialetheia* Sat. vi, Selden, *Table-Talk* xcvi, Cornwallis, *Essays* ('Of Opinion'), Drayton, *The Owle* [Works, ed. Hebel (Oxford, 1932), ii. 492].

the later play,¹ because in it Greville's idiosyncratic method is more identifiable. In *Alaham* it is not the outward action² which is of interest but the self-analyses of the characters and the manœuvring of Alaham and Hala in relation to each other's corrupted ambition. Greville's method is to inform their colloquies, which seem largely composed of lofty *sententiae*, with all the skill and passion resident in Alaham's and Hala's inward natures.

These are unfolded chiefly in soliloquies or in interchanges with persons indifferent to the main conflict. A continual tortured life goes on beneath the surface; 'all things are corrupt with doubleness' (Prologus, 149). When the play opens Alaham is in despair because his plans have so far failed; but rather than 'watch for change of times or Gods revenge' (i. i. 179) he resolves to strike all into hazard, since his 'State' is not bound to what Ford calls 'the laws of conscience and of civil use' but rests in his own well-being (214). Thus far we have been peering into the mind of an ambitious favourite. Alaham now switches to the outward policy with which 'ambition of revenge' (187) has inspired him by changing his tone from one of brooding introspection to a series of hypocritically uttered slogans: we must read i. i. 221-6 and i. i. 233-51 as private rehearsals of public 'policy'. But policy is on two levels, the slogans in which it is dressed, and the real intention behind it. It is this real intention, displayed in one aspect—the future conduct of the State Church—that animates the instructions which Alaham now gives to the priest (258-84). Lastly (315-25), Alaham invokes the Evil Spirits to work the ruin and change which he desires. Throughout the scene Alaham's conduct is delineated on four levels, which succeed one another; internal confusion and introspection, a display of outward hypocrisy, a controlled interpretation of the purpose of the hypocrisy, and an invocation to demons. The change from confusion to resolution is suddenly worked by 'visions' (185): it is one of those irruptions of supernatural evil which bring the action of the play throughout into contact with the Evil Spirits of the Chorus and the prologuizing Ghost. Alaham's 'character' is thus a complex four-dimensional world, ranging from 'inwardness' to supernatural visitings.

¹ Bullough, ed. cit. ii. 57-8.

² The action of *Alaham* falls into two divisions which may be entitled: (1) A palace intrigue: i. i-iii. iii. The ambitious Alaham succeeds in disposing of two Bashas, Mahomet and Caine, who stand between him and the throne occupied by his weak father. But Caine had been the lover of Alaham's wife Hala, a fact of which Alaham was aware, and Hala herself, who hoped to advance to power with Caine at her side, his deadliest rival. (2) Hala's revenge: iii. iv-end. Alaham seizes the throne and destroys the King, his daughter Caelica and his eldest son Zophi, a half-wit. But Hala's revenge has kept pace with Alaham's ambition: this woman has two children, one Alaham's and one Caine's. Alaham, dying of a poisoned robe, Hala's gift, is forced to witness the slaughter of his son; but when Alaham is dead, Hala finds she has killed the wrong child.

Hala's character has the same proportions. She, too, labours with an inward war, a struggle between her hatred for Alaham and her love for Caine (II. i. 2 *et passim*); her motives include lust as well as ambition and express themselves in an outward policy which is urged upon her by Alaham—and which she hypocritically embraces (II. ii, iii)—but her real intention is the destruction of Alaham and the exaltation of Caine. Later, after Caine has perished, the inward war is between her hatred of Alaham and her love for her children (III. iv. 23 ff.); her outward policy is acceptance of Alaham's *fait accompli*, but her real intention is revenge, to which her whole being becomes narrowed down, thus superseding the inner conflict (III. iv). She appeals to the supernatural spirits, including Caine's ghost (III. iv. 97–104; cf. v. iii. 130–6).

Since none of the other characters in the play is the mainspring of the action, but merely instrument, confidant, or victim, they are less complex. In them the level of outward action is precluded. We observe only their inward struggles, which are not, generally, struggles to perform any outward deed but to master the 'images of self-confusednesse' with which their human nature charges them. Thus the old King's misfortune is simply that he cannot do anything: he is 'one that hath lost Himself within; and so the world without' (v. ii. 54–5);¹ by his confusion all laws have lost authority (IV. i. 113). IV. i shows the continual inward movement by which he hopes to escape from the exercise of his legitimate authority and from life itself. Zophi the half-wit is in a similar condition (IV. ii. 20). Mahomet, unlike these victims, has achieved an inward control which allows him to consult his own heart before taking action (I. ii. 184); while he, too, is racked with an intestine war (II. iv. 63–6), he has a special power of insight which enables him to see into the hearts of Alaham (I. ii. 102–10) and Caine (II. iv. 120 ff.).² Caine himself shifts from the absorption of his whole being in his love for Hala, so that 'It is not I that live in me, but you' (II. iii. 100), to the 'inward discords' of remorse (II. iv. 99–104) and back again through an inability to sustain the mood of repentance (II. iv. 158–72). Caelica alone is exempted from these wearisome conditions.³

Greville's confrontation of Hala and Alaham has, beneath its sombre trapping of *sententiae*, an unexpected subtlety, not least because the *sententiae* themselves are dragooned into working their passage. The difficulty of applying a continuous understanding to II. ii, for example,

¹ The dying Alaham's condition is the same (v. iii. 54–5).

² That Greville let this promising character disappear after II. iv shows his determination to rig the balance in favour of the infernal spirits.

³ We need not accept the Ghost's gloss upon her conduct (Prologus, 119–25), but her unanswered prayer (IV. ii. 66–73) and her death by torture make her, like another Servetus, and like Mahomet, a sacrifice to rigorism.

may well be due to the unlooked-for convolutions of its texture.¹ Alaham, in the first lines of the scene, uses his state of inner confusion for dialectic's sake: his cry that Chance must be his guide, since his heart has run away from itself (II. ii. 8-9), shifts, in response to Hala's hypocritical offer of advice in the form of three *sententiae* (10-14), to the observation that advice offered from without is likely to be of less use than reliance purely upon a man's inner counsel. Hala's reply—

Who trusts his passion multiplies his care;
All paines within, all cures without vs are

shows that the two enemies are manœuvring within the limits of the characteristic antithesis (Inward, corruption or *εὐθυμία*; Outward, the help of others or of God, or 'Opinion', the 'casting of one's blood in others' veins). In reply, Alaham warns Hala that if she herself is 'captiued' by inner passions, then, by taking her advice, he will merely be exchanging his confusion for hers (19-20). This is indeed true, and we, as witnesses of Hala's resolution to deceive in the preceding scene, know it; but Hala assures Alaham that her whole state of mind is directed towards subserving his ends, and that her 'selfe-loue', the *quidditas* of her being, 'payes tribute' to his will (21-3). By changing the meaning of 'love' in his reply Alaham pierces through the mask of hypocrisy:

If loue haue power to leaue, and break her vow;
 How can I trust to that you promise now?
 If loue change not; how can I trust, and know,
 That you loue *Mahomet*, my ouerthrow?

This sudden thrust, an index of Greville's skill in using *sententiae* for toppling down as well as building up, leads to a further stage in the dialectic. To Hala's plea that Alaham had not forbidden free and 'indifferent' association with Mahomet, Alaham replies with a *sententia* to the effect that forbidding merely prevents a thought from manifesting itself in outward action and does not destroy it; further, forbidding is that which must be imposed by 'violence' on those who have no inward powers of inhibition (a hint here that such is Hala's case—Alaham sees into her heart). He adds a lie—that Mahomet had traduced her character, proclaiming 'deceit to be thy state of mind'. To this Hala answers lightly that in that case she may 'freely hate all men, but thee' (28-45). She is far from meaning this, for we know that Hala really loves Caine, hates Alaham himself, and is indifferent to Mahomet except as he blocks her way to power. But Alaham exploits the remark: Hate, he declares (46-7), is merely resident in the heart, nothing if not bodied forth in the outward form of revenge.

¹ Unlooked for, because the plays of Garnier, Daniel, Brandon, or Alexander are innocent of such sophistication. Since I am here concerned to trace only the dominant antithesis, I do not carry my commentary beyond a few scenes.

He relentlessly leads Hala to agree that she must be revenged on Mahomet; he urges on her that she cannot execute the act of revenge herself but must entrust it to Caine. This is the very impasse that Hala wishes to avoid, for she fears that Caine, as executant of the revenge, may be trapped by Alaham; she is therefore forced to make an unequivocal declaration of her intention to kill Mahomet (74-6). This declaration convinces Alaham himself that Hala is really his ally. (He has over-reached himself—for, although he has himself forced Hala to make the promise—which she does only to save Caine from a suspected trap—he none the less becomes convinced of Hala's love. This trust in Hala brings about his death.) In his moment of triumph he invokes, in an aside (77-82), the abstracts of evil to prosper the work now set on foot. In the succeeding lines (which must all be given to Alaham)¹ he promises Hala future glory, while she listens in an attitude of silent hatred or hypocritical gratification (83-104).² None the less he will send Caine to her. Hala's inward war in the final soliloquy enables her to reach a decision; it is a decision conforming to her literary ancestry—she ends the scene as a Medea.³

It is a text which, in Hoskins's phrase, has as many hands as a Briareus: 'It is very true that a sentence is a pearl in a discourse; but is it a good discourse that is all pearl? It is like an eye in the body; but is it not monstrous to be all eyes?'⁴ The criticism may be modified, in Greville's case, if we recollect how the *sententiae* in this and other scenes are made to subserve the movement of minds, the duckings and twists of the corrupt hearts.⁵

With this sample of Greville's method in *Alaham* before us, *Mustapha* must be treated more briefly. In *Mustapha*, the alinement of man seen through neo-Stoic eyes with man seen through Calvinist eyes is clear. 'Inwardness', too, is everywhere to be perceived: man may be a bee sucking honey or a spider drawing poison from the self-same flower—which, depends on his heart (II. ii. 160-1). Solyman experiences an inward war on a more extended scale than that of any of the characters in *Alaham*: it is waged between his duty of preserving his power as degenerate king and his love for his son Mustapha:

Two States I beare; his Father, and his King;
These two, being Relatiues, haue mutuall bonds;
Neglect in either, all in question brings. (II. ii. 15-17)

¹ In Bullough's printing of l. 83 *Hala*. appears to be a misprint for *Hala*!

² The line 'Ruine, the *power* (not *art*) of Princes is' (72) is a good example of Greville's aculeate style and his habit of squeezing the meanings of words.

³ Bullough, ll. 134-5, misprints either 'the' (for 'thy') or 'Oh' (for 'Of').

⁴ J. Hoskins, *Directions for Speech and Style*, ed. Hudson (Princeton, 1935), p. 39.

⁵ With II. ii can be compared III. iii. 39-96, where Hala accepts the outward situation (Alaham is seated on the throne by III. ii. 1) and uses *sententiae* as slogans to conceal her inmost mind. The scene proceeds on the level of outward action and only one glimpse of the involutions (Hala's aside, 32-7) is given.

Fear for his power and his Love for his son are the fighting abstracts which the *sententiae* overlay. (These are also the motives which the charitable Camena (II. iii. 135-52) sees influencing Rossa.) But Solyman is also blinded and 'captived' by his love for Rossa, and has delivered over the kingdom of his mind to her (I. i. 73); as he is man his humours are delicately balanced (I. ii. 18, and cf. Chorus Primus 1-22), but as he is King and the axis of the State they are even more sensitive and intricate (I. ii. 21-35, and cf. Chorus Quartus, 85-110). He cannot reconcile his powers and passions as King, man, and father (II. ii. 82-3). Solyman is finally being trapped, as Achmat explains, because he cannot perceive that his belief in his son's imaginary treason has been purposely made dependent upon, and the direct issue of, his love for Rossa (II. ii. 136-7). By murdering his son, he will really be murdering himself—all such unnatural acts are the product of Fear (II. ii. 147-8). The causes of Solyman's ruin are as complex as the relationship of his various inner debilities to the strong forces pressing from outside. Rossa's task would have been easier if he had been, like Rossa herself, a creature of extremes, willing to 'plant confusion in the powers above' by forsaking the laws of nature. Solyman's whole difficulty is in moulding the inward motions of his mind into an outward policy which will be congruent with kingship, manhood, and fatherhood. Like Alaham, he experiences supernatural visitings (IV. i).

Rossa is already a 'Monster growne within', and her outward actions are, unlike Solyman's, entirely congruent with her inward wickedness ('My self! What is it but my desire?' III. ii. 24). After she has twice tried and twice failed to persuade Solyman to execute Mustapha, she realizes that she is building her hopes on the quick-sand (III. i. 54; cf. I. ii. 84-6) of the King's temperament. In an important scene (III. i), she rejects Rosten's advice to continue her previous policy of teaching 'Power to doubt' (III. i. 112). Instead of trying to work from within upon the King, she must commit some outward act of violence and cruelty whose pressure of proof and horror will arm the King with a resolution he does not normally possess. This act is the murder of her own daughter Camena, after whose death she produces a tapestry supposed to be evidence that Camena has been conspiring with Mustapha. The King is convinced and Mustapha is slain. But both Solyman and Rossa have forgotten (as Rosten in III. i had not, and as we are continually being reminded by the Chorus) that the people, who favour Mustapha, are also an order in the State of which the tyrant's temperamental humours must take account; they revolt, and ruin threatens the kingdom.

Another element in the final ruin is Zanger's suicide. Zanger, Mustapha, Camena, and Achmat are built on neo-Stoic lines, although all their *εὐθυμία* is powerless to prevent the Rossa-Solyman relationship of inner

weakness and determined evil from issuing in disaster; only Achmat, a 'soule loving Nature, Dutie, Order' (v. iii. 109), survives to draw the moral and attempt, by manœuvring with *τύχη* (v. iii. 120), to save the state. For Achmat is a Stoic ('I first am Natures subiect, then my Princes', II. i. 75) who is prepared, unlike Chapman's Cato, to 'wrestle his faith vpon the stage of Chance' (II. i. 62) and contend with the 'heap of digested villainy' that is Cato's world, although he does not attain the resolution to pursue this virtuous course without an inward struggle. Virtue is in labour with chaos in Camena whose soliloquy (II. iii. 1-66) manipulates the antithesis of *ἀπερίη* and *τύχη*, and alines her, as Stoic heroine, with Marston's Sophonisba. Mustapha himself is a Stoic of single-minded virtue (IV. iv. 123-39).

The fact that these contrasts form the life-blood of the play means that it is irrelevant (and probably wrong) to identify Achmat or any other character as the 'projection of the author's own moral philosophy'.¹ Nor, perhaps, is it useful to say with Orsini: 'Tutti i personaggi sono . . . condannati dal severo giudizio dell' autore.'² The overweighting is there and must be recognized (most notably in the Choruses) in both *Alaham* and *Mustapha*, but the peculiar interest of Greville's plays lies in the strength and sincerity with which, beneath the crust of *sententiae* and the often rather jejune political speculation, the characters beat with their inward life and their effort to correlate action with desire.

In both *Alaham* and *Mustapha* the supernatural plays some part in the waging of the inward war. We are undoubtedly meant, in *Mustapha*, to look upon Rossa as a woman in some sort possessed by the vicious abstractions which are continually in her mouth: Rage, Envie, Desire, these Passions are also Furies, half-way between the Eumenides and the Calvinistic *Tartari* of *Alaham*. Rossa ends the play completely possessed by them—let the religious and the humble-minded rejoice, since, like the scapegoat, she will rid the land of them by bearing them all away with her (v. iv. 116-24), but let them also beware for she has become a vessel charged with their power to harm (v. iv. 125-6). Rossa's hatred of 'Mediocrity' in Passions (III. i. 75), which leads to her being ultimately possessed by 'Furies of choyce', which override the inward war and the outward sanction (v. iv. 48)³ is combined with deliberate invocation of the 'ugly Angells of th'infernall Kingdomes' (III. ii. 10-14). She offers her daughter up to Avernus (III. ii. 39-41) and describes herself to Solyman as a microcosm of Hell (IV. iii. 30-4).

¹ Croll, *The Works of Fulke Greville*, p. 42.

² N. Orsini, *Fulke Greville tra il Mondo e Dio* (Milan, 1941), p. 61.

³ v. iv. 48 reads: 'Furies of choyce, what arguments can move?' The difficulty of interpretation presented by this line is so typical of Greville that I have preferred, in this and similar instances, to let the interpretation I have chosen stand in my text without unfolding possible alternatives.

The tendency in *Mustapha* for the wicked Passions either to become objective infernal spirits or to be directly attributed to the activity of such spirits is accelerated in *Alaham*. In this play Greville is interested in the objective manifestation of supernatural evil, the 'metaphysical aid' with which Lady Macbeth was infatuated. For neither are the angels 'nothing but good motions or inspirations which God excites in the minds of men' nor the devils 'nothing but bad affections or perturbations suggested by our carnal nature'.¹ The 'Furies', too, the passions seen in their objective aspect as tormenting man from without, are still further objectified in the 'Chorus Secundus of *Furies*: Malice. Crafte. Pride. Corrupt Reason. Evil Spirits'. Here the Evil Spirits *are* the Furies. In another Chorus the Evil Spirits are identified with the fallen angels, 'exiles out of heauen' (Chorus Tertius, 176), just as the abstract 'Fury', Corrupt Reason, has herself fallen (Chorus Secundus, 18). The Evil Spirits, including the prologuizing Ghost, perform the Calvinistic function of 'exercising believers' by warring against them, but can never overcome them (Chorus Tertius, 101-8);² created though they were by God, their sinful nature, like that of Calvin's Devil,³ comes not from creation, but from 'depravation' and privation (Prologus, 21-33). 'They hold the wicked in thralldom, exercise dominion over their minds and bodies, and employ them as bond-slaves in all kinds of iniquity.'⁴ Hence Hala's and Alaham's invocations and possessions. In all this the inactivity of the Good Spirits is noticeable. The dramaturgical problem is here mixed with the theological. As a Calvinist, Greville holds to the doctrine of predestination,⁵ but it is difficult to write a drama of the inward war in which the nature of the *personae* is already so irrevocably determined. (The defects of *The Atheist's Tragedy* as a drama of *spiritual* struggle illustrate this contention.) It was perhaps because Greville wished to avoid too neat a division of his characters into the elect and the unregenerate that he chose a non-Christian milieu, since he is thereby freed from the obligations imposed by his theological convictions. This choice faced Greville with another difficulty, one which he has by no means completely solved: for all 'Mohammedans' are likely to be synonymous with the 'unregenerate' and the possibility of inward conflict is again destroyed. Greville partly solves this problem by discovering neo-Stoicism amongst the Pashas, and partly the solution was ready-made in the French Senecan form, the approximation of Hala and Rossa to the Medea type. But more importantly, and despite the affinities of his supernatural spirits with the Calvinistic devils and angels, Greville

¹ Calvin, op. cit., i. 209.

² Cf. *ibid.* i. 203, 207.

³ *Ibid.* i. 205. Cf. Greville's lines on the Fall, *Mustapha*, Cho. 4, 1-16.

⁴ Calvin, op. cit., i. 207.

⁵ 'Of Religion', stanzas 95 ff.

avoids too rigoristic and undramatic a milieu by a blurring of the distinction between the objective evil Spirits and the 'Furies' of the human heart. The wickedness of Alaham and the rest thus becomes not merely a question of their not enjoying Grace, with the Devil and his Angels free, in Calvin's phrase, to 'exercise dominion' over them: the 'Furies' are as much a subjective product of the characters' inward evil as they are participators in, and allies of, the objective evil activity of the Devil and his Spirits. For to be possessed by and to invoke the evil spirits with the confidence of an Alaham implies more than a simple objectification of their mode of being. In 'A Letter to an Honourable Lady' Greville writes:

These extremities of good or euill will not easily be beleueed to raigne in these middle natures of flesh and blood: in respect that God hath decreed the angels to heauen, the diuels to hell; and left the Earth to man, as a meane creation between these two extremes. So that he must be a kind of diuell himselfe, that can easily beleuee there should be diuels raining within or amongst vs.

Greville managed to avoid, for the sake of depicting the inward war, a Manicheism which would have been objectionable to him as a Calvinist, and a Calvinism which might have been frustrating to him as a dramatist. That Greville does not, in spite of this compromise, succeed in convincing us that he has not rigged the balance in favour of scepticism and pessimism is as much due to his choice of the Senecan form, with all its monstrosities of parricide and infanticide, as to the fact that his mind was coloured and his imagination fired by a contemporary belief in human corruption.

The compromise accounts for the ambiguity with which we view Hala's end (*Alaham*, v. iii. 128-46). This terrible passage, so powerfully written that it almost justifies French Senecanism, is very difficult to understand. Perhaps it is a prelude to a physical descent into Hell, or perhaps Hala's wits have gone. What is certain is that Hala is here accorded no sort of triumph in Medean fashion, and that behind Greville's variation on the Senecan finale lies the whole weight of a new period's discovery of the potentialities for good or evil of the inward man. In this case, for evil; for it is Hell itself that, in Alexander's phrase, has been placed within Hala.

Greville is more vividly aware than most of his contemporaries that those things which we identify as outward evils, abstract or Furious, and their formulation in institutions, wars, false Churches, and great crimes, are manufactured out of the evil within, motes from the heap of dust and corruption that the 'Paradise' of the unregenerate human heart has become; the Devil, however objectified, can never absolve man from punishment for his own 'uncreated' sin. Neither the theory of 'Fortune's shoures', nor the *Mens adepta*, nor 'outward holiness' can avail to cancel that dreadful

bond. The emphasis on the correlation between outward weakness and crime and their origin within the creature is the essential psychological principle upon which Greville's *personae* are constructed. Greville, therefore, could not trust his steps to the clew which guided Chapman and Daniel through the human labyrinth. For Greville, it cannot be the confusion between old decrees and later institutions, of which Drayton wrote in *The Owle*, that accounts for the foundering of the Elizabethan achievement; man's iniquity runs deeper in his blood, inaccessible to the lancing of any satirist: 'an infinite justice is offended', said Hall. But Greville did find that the Stoic emphasis on the inward order and the kinds of outward iniquity made popular by Seneca were materials which he could charge with fears and hatreds discovered by quite another tradition. In *Mustapha* and *Alaham* the outward ways by which such evils proceed are merely paths leading back and back to the new Avernus in the human heart:

All what the world admires comes from within;
A doome, whereby the sinne, condemnes the sinne.

COLERIDGE AND SOUTHEY IN BRISTOL, 1795

By GEORGE WHALLEY

THE association of Coleridge and the two Wordsworths in Somerset has been closely examined and frequently celebrated. But before Coleridge met Wordsworth he ran into Southey by chance in Oxford; and the consequences of that meeting were nothing if not fateful. Pantisocracy, the child of Southey's dreaming and the nucleus of the collaboration of 1795, has so often been discussed with indulgent condescension that the Bristol period has to some degree escaped serious attention. Yet both Southey and Coleridge bear weighty testimony, at the time and later, that that conjunction of their orbits was crucial; and if their letters of the period are sometimes light-headed or pompous there is no suggestion of trifling. 'Our names are written in the book of destiny, on the same page', Southey writes in February 1795; and in July, '[this last] twelvemonth . . . has improved my head & heart whatever effect it may have had on my happiness'. In 1804 Southey said that their first meeting 'decided the destiny of both', and on the occasion of Coleridge's death that 'from that meeting the course of my life received its bias'.¹ Southey spoke then with deeper truth perhaps than he himself knew. Coleridge's references to the meeting are rarer, more guarded, more agonized. A letter to Morgan in 1808 gives some indication of the range of the effect upon himself: 'O had I health and youth and were what I once was—but I played the fool and cut the throat of my own happiness, of my own genius, of my utility, in compliment to the merest phantom of over-strained honor—O Southey, Southey, what an unthinking man were you, and an unjust!'²

With the tragic consequences of that meeting, and with the rights and wrongs of their relationship, we are not here concerned. Such autobiographical accounts as Southey and Coleridge have left stop short of the Bristol period or pass it over in silence, leaving the period lightly documented. But in addition to the *Gutch Memorandum Book* a single document,

¹ (a) *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, ed. C. C. Southey [hereafter referred to as *R.S.*] (London, 1849-50), i. 231. (b) Bodleian MS. Eng. Letters, c. 22 [hereafter Bod. MS. (A)], f. 155. (c) *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey*, ed. J. W. Warter [hereafter *R.S.L.*] (London, 1856), i. 270-1. (d) Bodleian MS. Eng. Letters, d. 49, f. 45.

The abbreviations used in this paper are for the most part the same as those used by Mr. Lawrence Hanson in his *The Life of S. T. Coleridge, The Early Years* [hereafter *Hanson*] (London, 1938, and New York, 1939).

The editions of Southey's letters frequently omit or alter passages in the manuscripts. I have often cited the manuscript even when the extract appears in the printed versions.

² *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. L. Griggs [hereafter *U.L.*] (New Haven and London, 1933), i. 403-4.

spanning the whole period, has survived—the bare laconic record of their borrowings from the Bristol Library Society, starting before the two men first met and continuing beyond their first separation and the creation of Coleridge's three great Stowey poems.¹ Completely to unravel all the implications of the Bristol Library borrowings would involve a biographical reconstruction far beyond the limit of the years 1793 to 1798, and the repetition of much of the work of Haller and Simmons, Dykes Campbell, Lowes, and Lawrence Hanson.² Because the months of the Bristol collaboration remain confused in detail and indistinct in outline I wish to evince from that single document details to clarify some biographical problems and to throw light upon the poetical development of the two men.

I

Southey's first recorded borrowing from the Bristol Library Society is entered for 22 October 1793. Between that date and the following June, when he first met Coleridge, twenty entries (of which only one is in his own hand) appear for Southey in the Library register. 'At that time', he noted later, 'I was a verbatim reader of indefatigable patience.'³ During those eight months we can follow his conscientious, methodical reading—history and topography, Headley's *Ancient English Poetry*, Homer and Theocritus in translation, Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, Godwin's *Political Justice*, Mary Wollstonecraft's *Rights of Woman*; but first of all Enfield's *History of Philosophy* of which we shall have more to say presently. Behind this orderly list we see clearly an earnest young man whose 'mimosa sensibility' was as much disturbed by the stinging political and social issues of his day as by the more theoretical problems which cast their shadow in front of his facile poetic quill. Then in the middle of June 1794 he meets Coleridge in Oxford, and the centre of gravity in his reading immediately shifts although the patient method is not noticeably disturbed. After Coleridge arrived in Bristol to take up permanent residence in January 1795, the pattern of Southey's list disintegrates and reveals the outline of the joint pursuits to which they then addressed themselves. Indeed, between March and June 1795 the borrowings of the two cannot be disentangled with any certainty. In the middle of June 1795 an abrupt break occurs in Southey's borrowings. Thereafter he made only three entries in the

¹ For a transcript of the Southey and Coleridge borrowings, and some account of the Bristol Library Society, see 'The Bristol Library Borrowings of Southey and Coleridge, 1793-8', *The Library*, vol. iv, no. 2 (Sept. 1949), pp. 114-32.

² As far as possible I have recounted known biographical details only as they are immediately relevant to this inquiry. No account is given of relations with Lovell, Burnett, Cottle, Estlin, and others.

³ *Southey's Commonplace Book*, ed. J. W. Warton [hereafter *S.C.B.*] (London, 1876), iv, 515.

Register; and these are the seeds of fresh poems as he withdrew irrevocably from that Pantisocratic dream which had first brought him into collaboration with Coleridge.

Lowes's *The Road to Xanadu* has made familiar the pattern, method, and creative penetration of Coleridge's reading. But his concentration upon the curiosity and range of Coleridge's reading between 1795 and 1798 has thrown into the background the range and curiosity of Southey's reading: it has also tended to conceal the importance of Southey's early influence upon Coleridge.¹ Taking his departure from much less bookish surroundings than Coleridge's, Southey was already in 1794 a *helluo librorum* in his own right. His account (written in 1823) of discovering *Gerusalemme Liberata*, *Orlando Furioso*, and *The Faerie Queene* reads like a passage from *The Road to Xanadu*;² and even if the four large published volumes of Southey's *Commonplace Book* look a little too much like the work-books of a professional polymath, they reflect 'an hydroptic, immoderate thirst of human learning' comparable with Coleridge's.³ The history of their boyhood reading is strikingly similar. For a time in early manhood their reading was nearly identical. But the men were temperamentally different, their education was different, and the poetry which grew out of the Bristol reading was very different. Haller's conclusion about Southey is just, and precludes the notion that reading of a certain kind can produce poetry of a certain kind: 'He remained always in the tragic position of the man who, within his limitations, has left nothing undone that he can do to be a very great poet, and lacks nothing necessary for being one except genius.'⁴

Wordsworth, despite his later inflexibility, responded creatively in his early association with Coleridge: Southey did not. In October 1795 Southey acknowledged that his 'poetical taste was much meliorated by Bowles, and the constant company of Coleridge';⁵ but he resisted the more profound creative influence of Coleridge with a firmness approaching the obtuse. Despite his acute sensibility and wide-ranging interests, Southey's moral rectitude—rapidly hardening throughout these months of 1795—

¹ By failing to show how far Coleridge's reading was similar to that of many of his intelligent contemporaries, Lowes lost an opportunity of emphasizing the uniqueness of Coleridge's creative faculty.

² R.S. i. 83-4.

³ Cf. Coleridge's marginal note of ?1819 in a copy of *Omniana* (British Museum, C. 45, a. 4): 'Hush! hush!—dear Southey! do not write on what you do not know.—The subjects are so few, with which you are not acquainted, that this abstinence would be but a trifling sacrifice & the occasions of rare occurrence.'

⁴ William Haller, *The Early Life of Robert Southey, 1774-1803* [hereafter Haller] (New York, 1917), p. 264. Cf. p. 72: 'Hardly a single poetic experiment was being attempted by any versifier of the day which Southey, in his exuberant youth, did not initiate, or share, or join.'

⁵ R.S. i. 247.

made him rigid, opaque, and intolerant; and not even the impact of Coleridge's mercurial ebullience could work a sea-change in him.¹

The incompatibility of Southey and Coleridge has not escaped attention; but usually it has been examined, at this period, in the light of the external crises arising from Pantisocracy and Coleridge's engagement to Sarah Fricker.² But Pantisocracy simply became the battle-ground over which their fundamental incompatibility was fought out. Pantisocracy needed money: this need threw them upon their only resource—their pens. Their active literary collaboration lasted for little more than six months. But during that period they wrote together and shared each other's books. If we compare the two men at the intellectual and imaginative level we see that disagreement would arise as quickly and inevitably as between Van Gogh and Gauguin. And the library record of the raw materials for their collaboration bears testimony enough to the centrifugal forces which, from the very beginning, threatened to destroy a delicate balance of divergent personalities—a balance which could probably not have been achieved at all without some specific and practical enthusiasm like Pantisocracy.

A mere glance at the two lists of borrowings suggests the nature of the difference between the two men; and the difference is not simply that between a methodical and an immethodical man, for Coleridge had his method too, esoteric it may be but well worth discovering. Closer scrutiny of two items shows the difference more clearly and suggests the sort of disagreements which, magnified by proximity, soon became intolerable to both.

In October 1793 Southey borrowed and read Enfield's *History of Philosophy* (Borrowings 1, 2). At the end of a high-spirited letter to Bedford, Southey writes self-consciously (26 October 1793): 'You must not be surprised at nonsense, for I have been reading the history of philosophy, the ideas of Plato, the logic of Aristotle, and the heterogeneous dogmas of Pythagoras, Antisthenes, Zeno, Epicurus, and Pyrrho, till I have metaphysicized away all my senses.'³ Southey, with disturbed and indifferent schooling, was largely self-taught; if Oxford gave him better opportunities

¹ Dorothy Wordsworth writes of Southey in June 1798: 'He is a young man of the most rigidly virtuous habits & is I believe exemplary in the discharge of all domestic duties, but tho his talents are certainly very remarkable for his years (as far as I can judge) I think them much inferior to the talents of Coleridge.' *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. E. de Selincourt [hereafter *W.L.*] (London, 1935-7), i. 196.

² See Haller; Hugh l'Anson Fausset, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1926); Hanson; E. L. Griggs, *Coleridge Fille* (London, 1940), and 'Robert Southey's Estimate of Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Study in Human Relations', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, ix (1945-6), 61-94.

³ *R.S.* i. 185. In an undated letter immediately following (*ibid.* i. 186-7) Southey's thoughts on Enfield run over into a half-facetious dream of founding a 'Southeyopolis'. There is an earlier hint of Pantisocracy in a letter of 25 January 1793 (*Bod. MS. (A), f. 48*). The letters of November and December 1793 are better known (*R.S.* i. 193-4, 196).

for self-education it did not provide him with a mentor to stretch and stimulate his mind. He suffered from uncertainty, moral, social, and intellectual. There was nothing in his mental history to help him to distinguish between a history of philosophy and philosophy itself. With no philosophical bent either natural or acquired, he was not to borrow any single work of formal philosophy during the three years he used the Bristol Library—if we except Godwin's *Political Justice* and Hartley *On Man*. On 12 June 1796 we find him forswearing metaphysics and claiming to be able to prove that 'all the material and necessarian controversies [are] "much ado about nothing"'. Whether or not Southey was wise so to neglect philosophy, and whether or not Coleridge was wise to become so engrossed with it, we are not here concerned to inquire. At very least Southey's impatience of philosophy became the keystone of the dyspathy which was soon to separate the two poets.

When Coleridge first met Southey he already had behind him a long history of arduous schooling and some strenuous if sporadic scholarship; and, on Lamb's word as well as Coleridge's, he was already firmly set in that 'habit of abstruse research' which he later came to regard as one of the causes of his undoing as a poet. In 1794 and 1795 Coleridge, somewhat versed in academic philosophy and radical thought, and with an incurable flair for philosophical disquisition, was beginning to feel the power of his mind and the stir of his imagination. The 'inspired charity-boy' had reason to feel self-assured. But from that self-assurance grew the restless idiosyncrasy which Southey distrusted, and the condescending arrogance against which Lamb was soon to revolt.¹ But we must also remember Coleridge's remarkable maturity; that late in 1797 he was to tackle, single-handed by letter, the radical atheist Thelwall, thereby converting to Christianity Thelwall, and as a by-product Godwin.

Coleridge's reaction to Enfield's *History of Philosophy* is interesting. In March 1795 he borrowed volume i, kept it for ten days, and did not continue with the second (Borrowing 43). Two years later he turned to the original of which Enfield was an abridgement, Brücker's two-volume *Historia Critica Philosophiae* (Borrowings 93, 94)—possibly the first concrete example of that habit of verifying originals which Lowes has emphasized. As far as I can discover Coleridge made no comment upon either Enfield or Brücker as early as 1797. Early in 1800, discussing with Southey a projected 'History of Levellers', he recommends Brücker with reservations.² But in 1815, writing of his plans for the *Logosophia*, he makes

¹ Lamb's withering *Theses quaedam theologicae*, addressed to Coleridge in May 1798, suspended their friendship for two years. See *The Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb*, ed. E. V. Lucas [hereafter *C.L.*] (London, 1935), i. 126-7.

² *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. E. H. Coleridge [hereafter *L.*] (Boston and New York, 1895), i. 330.

a remark which may have germinated as early as 1797: 'A perspicuous compendium of the Hist. of Phil. has been long wanted: for Enfield's is a mere Booksellers *Job* Abridgment of Brucker, a man of great learning and unwearied industry, but scantily gifted with the true philosophical instinct'.¹ The *Logosophia* with its introductory history of philosophy was never completed. But the Philosophical Lectures of 1818-19 take a magnificent stride towards a history of philosophy which shall be more than 'collections of sentences and extracts, formed into separate groups under the several names, and taken (at first or second hand) from the several writings of individual philosophers, with no *principle* of arrangement, with no *method*, and therefore without unity and without progress or completion'.² Whitehead has observed that disagreement is not a disaster; it is an opportunity for discovery. Can it be that arguments with Southey in the College Street lodgings came to fulfilment after more than twenty years in the Philosophical Lectures?

For we catch a glimpse of Southey and Coleridge in their lodgings, with the shadows of Lovell and Burnett in the background. 'Coleridge goes to work like a hound', Southey wrote in 1810, 'nosing his way, turning, and twisting, and winding and doubling, till you get weary with following the mazy movements. My way is, when I see my object, to dart at it like a greyhound.'³ 'The truth is', wrote Coleridge in November 1795, 'you sat down and wrote; I used to saunter about and think what I should write. And we ought to appreciate our comparative industry by the quantum of mental exertion, not the particular mode of it—by the number of thoughts collected, not by the number of lines through which these thoughts are diffused.'⁴ No doubt the mazy movements of Coleridge's mind could be maddening beyond endurance. But the difference between the two men was not simply a divergence of interests nor the gap of two years between their ages. Southey's greyhound directness assumed too abstract a view of the distinctness of an imaginative 'object': he never experienced, he never quite understood, that working of the imagination, which 'dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to recreate'.

¹ U.L. ii. 137.

² Prospectus for the Philosophical Lectures of 1818-19. See *The Philosophical Lectures of Samuel Taylor Coleridge Hitherto Unpublished*, ed. Kathleen Coburn (London, 1949), where Coleridge speaks in similar terms of dissent about Enfield, Brucker, Stanley, and—by implication—Tennemann.

³ R.S.L. ii. 188-9; and cf. Hanson, p. 441, n. 36. In a marginal note to *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, written 1 September 1825, Coleridge discusses Kenyon's views on the temperamental differences between Southey and himself; and concludes: 'S[outhey] = a Greyhound: S.T.C. a Pointer.' [British Museum, Ashley 4772 (copy)]. Wordsworth wrote in 1844: 'Observe the difference of execution in the poems of Coleridge and Southey, how masterly is the workmanship of the former, compared with the latter; the one persevered in labour unremittingly, the other could lay down his work at pleasure and turn to anything else' (*W.L.* vi. 1231).

⁴ L. i. 149-50.

II

The point of greatest interest in the Bristol association of Southey and Coleridge is their concern with that crucial problem for the poet—the symbolic transmutation of experience. Both were acutely aware of the problem and tackled it, theoretically and practically, with determined energy. Again we see clearly the divergence of the two minds; but Southey makes a contribution here which has not, I think, been previously recognized, and which goes far to justify Southey's claim of October 1795 that '[Coleridge] did me much good—I him more'.¹

Southey, I suggest, stimulated Coleridge's interest in the poetic possibilities of travel literature and the twilight materials of nascent science.

Even since the emergence of the English novel, travel literature had been the staple of light reading. Explorations were going ahead and accounts of them, both written and verbal, were actively current, adding to the older stores laid up by Hakluyt and Purchas.² Mr. Blunden has drawn attention to the Christ's Hospital custom of improvising tales of travel and adventure, presumably on the pattern of Defoe and his imitators.³ And Coleridge, who could see from the dormer window of his Bristol lodgings the masts of ships—slavers, merchantmen, and men-of-war—lying in the pools and at the wharves of the second seaport of England, cannot but have been stirred by the fabulous currents that crossed the sea-walls. Southey, then, can scarcely be said to have introduced Coleridge to the literature of travel.⁴ But when did Coleridge begin to recognize the poetic possibilities of such material? Admittedly there are sea-images in his contributions to Boyer's *Liber Aureus*; but they are stereotyped and show no sign of taking on that peculiar fire with which Coleridge was soon to endow his poetic images.

¹ Bod. MS. (A), f. 163.

² In his letter of 25 January 1793 anticipating Pantisocracy (cited on p. 327, n. 3 above), Southey mentions the *Bounty* mutiny in terms which suggest its currency: 'if the *Bounty* mutineers had not behaved so cruelly to their officers I should have been the last to condemn them—Otaheite independent of its women had many inducements not only for the sailor but the philosopher.' See J. L. Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu* [hereafter *Xanadu*] (revised edition, Boston and New York, 1930), p. 468, n. 125, for an account of reports of the *Bounty* mutiny.

³ 'Coleridge at Christ's Hospital', in *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Studies by Several Hands* . . . , ed. E. L. Griggs and E. Blunden (London, 1934).

⁴ Southey may well, however, have introduced Coleridge to specific works. See *S.C.B.* iv. 515-16: 'Coleridge took up a volume [of Cartwright's *Journal*], and was delighted with its strange simplicity.' Southey was reading Cartwright between 5 and 18 September 1794 (Borrowings 25-7); he is mistaken in dating the occurrence in 1793 in *S.C.B.* If Southey here refers to the reading of September 1794, he raises a problem in dating Coleridge's departure for London and Cambridge. Southey wrote to Bedford on 22 August: 'Coleridge left me yesterday. it was like the losing a limb to part with him' (Bod. MS. (A), f. 126). Coleridge wrote from London, postmark 6 September 1794: 'I arrived safe after a most unpleasant journey—I lost my Casimir on the road' (*U.L.* i. 21). Chambers accepts the earlier date, Hanson the later.

The details of Coleridge's early reading of travel literature are far from clear. In an undated letter of 1794 he says that, in preparation for the Pantisocratic venture, 'The minutiae of topographical information we are daily endeavouring to acquire'.¹ The Bristol Library registers do not, however, reflect any very determined effort in this direction. Coleridge had other sources of books, no doubt; Haller, Lowes, and Lane Cooper have recovered a few details, but much of it is conjectural and most of it late. Before 1797 the Library registers assign very few works of travel to Coleridge: one work on the slave trade and two on the West African and West Indian Colonies (Borrowings 61, 64, 49), and two of these are clearly connected with his lecture on the Slave Trade. Benyovsky's *Memoirs* (Borrowing 98) was read in December 1797 specifically for the abortive 'Siberian Exiles'. Lowes has shown something of the importance of *Anthologia Hibernica*, the *Manchester Memoirs*, and the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* (Borrowings 76, 104, 105); but these were all late readings, and incidentally contain much more germinal material than Lowes discusses—material reaching out into other regions than the three great poems. Three travel books of importance to *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan*—Bruce, Bartram, and Purchas—do not appear in the Bristol borrowings at all; and judging from the *Gutch Memorandum Book* Bartram turned up in Stowey and not in Bristol.² Keate's *Pelew Islands* makes its first specific appearance in a note to the 1796 edition of *Poems on Various Subjects*; but since Lee Boo appears in the original version of the poem 'To a Young Lady' Coleridge may have been reading Keate late in 1794—after meeting Southey.³ All these outstanding items point to dates after

¹ *Biographia Epistolaris* . . . , ed. A. Turnbull [hereafter *B.E.*] (London, 1911), i. 45.

² (a) James Bruce, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile* (London, 1790). Coleridge knew of Bruce's work at Cambridge (*Xanadu*, p. 495, n. 30); but there is no way of dating the reference to Bruce in 'Religious Musings' [*Poems*, ed. E. H. Coleridge, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1912), i. 119], since the earliest complete version of that poem is the published version of 1796. By 1807 Coleridge did not own a copy of Bruce (*W.L.* ii. 140). (b) William Bartram, *Travels through North and South Carolina* . . . (Philadelphia and London, 1791). The first definite reference to Bartram in *Gutch Memorandum Book* [hereafter *G.M.B.*], ff. 31^v–32, appears in a context which suggests the date to be the turn of the year 1797–8. But a notebook entry, possibly of late 1796, referring to Erasmus Darwin, may carry an overtone of Bartram [*Anima Poetae*, ed. E. H. Coleridge (London, 1895), p. 4]. Copies of both Bruce and Bartram were held by the Bristol Library Society and were in active circulation when Coleridge was using the Library. The Society also held a copy of Hakluyt's *Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries* . . . , 3 vols. folio (London, 1598–1600). (c) The copy of *Purchas his Pilgrimage* which started *Kubla Khan* has never been traced. There was no copy in the Bristol Library at this time. Presumably it was not Wordsworth's, for Lamb sent a copy to William and Dorothy as a present in June 1804 (*C.L.* i. 370). It may have been Thomas Poole's; but the contents of his library were not recorded, and, as far as I can determine, the disposal of his books is not known.

³ *Poems*, i. 64. The first version of the poem is in *L.* i. 94. Joseph Cottle borrowed Keate's *Pelew Islands* from the Bristol Library three times in 1796: 4 January–8 February; 29 March–9 May; 5–19 August (Appendix to Borrowings). *Poems on Various Subjects* was

meeting Southey, and most of them to dates after the break with Southey.

When did Coleridge start making creative use of such material? If we except 'The Mimic Morn Electric' of the Sonnet to William Godwin (which owes much to his Cambridge favourite, Erasmus Darwin, and probably also to Thomson), and the long note on 'Light from plants' added to 'Lines written at Shurton Bars', the 'footless birds of Paradise' in 'The Eolian Harp' offer the first example of curious material glowing with the light of *The Ancient Mariner*.¹ 'The Eolian Harp' was written on 20 August 1795. There is nothing like it except for the anticipation of the Mariner's sea-snakes in his contribution to Book II of *Joan of Arc*, written at about the same time.²

During the closing years of the eighteenth century Tasso, Ariosto and Dante, Gray, Ossian, and the *Edda*, northern themes and exotic materials, were with Milton solid constituents of the literary climate. Wordsworth took a copy of *Orlando Furioso* on his walking tour in the Alps in 1791. Everybody seemed to be sickening for epics: *Joan of Arc* was 'An Epic Poem', Joseph Cottle's *Alfred* appeared in 1801 to the contemptuous delight of Lamb and Coleridge, and even Coleridge himself laid portentous plans for an epic on the origin of evil. As we watch the development of Southey, Coleridge, and Wordsworth we witness a poetic discovery—or more properly, rediscovery—no less dramatic and important than Chaucer's trimming of sail in *Anelide and Arcite* as he discovers the method for *Troilus and Criseyde*.

Southey's letters and *Commonplace Book* suggest that his reading of travel and topography was already extensive and curious before he met

apparently ready for publication on 30 March, and was actually published on 16 April 1796 (*B.E.* i. 66; *Poems*, ii. 1135, n. 2).

¹ (a) *Poems*, i. 86. For Coleridge's early acquaintance with Darwin's *Botanic Garden* see *Biographia Literaria* (ed. Shawcross), i. 11-12; Christopher Wordsworth's *Diary* printed at the end of his *Social Life at the English Universities in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1874); *G.M.B.*, f. 16v. See also *Xanadu*, pp. 96-100, where the phrase is compared with a similar passage in 'The Destiny of Nations'. (b) *Poems*, i. 99-100. The poem is dated September 1795. (c) *Poems*, i. 101, lines 23-5. See also *Xanadu*, p. 458, n. 57, where the connexion with *Anthologia Hibernica* (Borrowing 76) is noted. The printed errata to the 1796 *Poems* (p. [189]) argue against Lowes's contention that the lines were added immediately before publication. A draft of the lines appears in *G.M.B.* (f. 6) in a context suggesting May or June 1795. In a letter to Cottle of 3 July 1797, containing errata for *Poems* 1797 (original in the Houghton Library, Harvard; E. H. Coleridge's copy of the letter in *L.* i. 220-1 omits the errata), Coleridge writes: 'P 97. Scratch out these three lines "Where melodies [. . .] untamed wing."' Cottle for some reason did not comply; the lines stand in the 1797 edition and were not omitted until 1803. Keats, however, seems to have liked the lines, for we find 'legless birds of Paradise' on 'the warm angled winter-screen' in *The Eve of Saint Mark* (composed 13-17 February 1819). Keats owned a copy of Coleridge's *Poems*, 1797, at the time of his death.

² *Poems*, i. 140, lines 285-91, and note.

Coleridge: and we know that that reading had a specific poetic purpose in view. During the Bristol period, and indeed for some time before and after, Southey was much concerned to revivify epic poetry by using exotic materials and mythologies. At an early date Southey planned to use the northern materials he had glimpsed in Gray's work, in Sayers's *Dramatic Sketches of Northern Mythology*, and in Percy's translation of Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*. The first book Southey ever bought for himself—in the autumn of 1792 after leaving Westminster—was Sayers's *Dramatic Sketches*.¹ Since the work of Gray and Collins, Sayers's desire 'of giving some slight idea of the neglected beauties of the Gothic religion, and of recommending a freer introduction of its imagery into the Poetry of the English nation' can hardly be taken for an innovation. But his notes, referring to the *Edda*, Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*, the *Asiatic Researches*, and the like, are more suggestive than the *Sketches* themselves; and Sayers became the god of Southey's idolatry. In June 1794 Southey wrote that Sayers was 'a man to whom I am more obliged for enlarging my views in poetry than to any author ancient or modern'.² Sayers gave Southey the monodrama form;³ he also left him with the fatal conviction that use of certain kinds of 'poetic' material may absolve the writer of the responsibility of being a poet.

It is impossible to imagine that Southey did not discuss these problems and enthusiasms with Coleridge as eagerly as he was later to discuss them with William Taylor. There is even quite sound evidence for believing that he showed Sayers's book to Coleridge.⁴ Coleridge seems to have responded at first, for we find on the third folio of the *Gutch Memorandum Book* the tentative note: 'Jonas—a monodrama.' But three months later he writes to Southey: 'I detest monodramas, but I never wished to establish my judgment on the throne of critical despotism.'⁵ Southey no doubt clarified the problem for Coleridge by providing the resistance of argument. But Coleridge has picked out the tiny fruitful seed; it will take time to come to flower, but when it does it will not be recognizable as owing anything to Sayers or to Southey. Coleridge was working towards his own solution,

¹ J. W. Robberds, *A Memoir of the Life and Writings of . . . William Taylor of Norwich*, 2 vols. (London, 1843), i. 447.

² Bod. MS. (A), f. 113.

³ Sayers in his Preface to 'Oswald' in the *Sketches* describes the monodrama as 'a species of play, which has not yet, as far as I am able to discover, been attempted by English writers'. Southey wrote eight monodramas, beginning with 'Sappho' in 1793 and ending with 'La Caba' in 1802.

⁴ On 20 July 1794 Southey wrote to Bedford asking among other things for 'Sayers & the Minstrel as I want them particularly'. The same request was repeated in Southey's letter introducing Coleridge to Bedford, and again on 13 October (Bod. MS. (A), ff. 126, 128, 133).

⁵ L. i. 93.

by way of Gray, Collins and Young, Akenside, and Bowles, in his own poetry. The theoretical exposition of it begins tentatively to take shape in his reviews of Gothic romances in the *Critical Review* (1794-8) as he approaches his theory of Dramatic Illusion. He had plenty of opportunity to watch and test Southey's theories while they worked together on *Joan of Arc* and criticized each other's shorter poems. The 'shaping Spirit of Imagination' was only just beginning to possess Coleridge; and the way to *The Ancient Mariner* was not marked out with theories. Coleridge admired Southey's early work at the time: not until much later did he see, with clear critical detachment, that Southey's semi-didactic manipulation of exotic materials was 'cold-blooded carpentry' and a poetical failure. Theoretical clarity was withheld until, in discussion with Wordsworth in 1799 and 1800, Coleridge meditated upon what had happened to him at Stowey and in the Quantocks. Meanwhile his theory of poetry remained happily in suspension; and in the short but intimate collaboration in Bristol, as Coleridge acknowledged in *Biographia Literaria*, Southey was not the only debtor.

If Southey could contribute, he could not follow; his mind and imagination moved in a different orbit. On 11 November 1797, two years after their first separation, Southey wrote from Portugal to his naval brother: 'You are on the seas. If at any time the morning or evening appearance of the water strikes you as singularly beautiful or strange, and you should not dislike to register the appearance, do keep some little log-book of this kind for me: tell its tints at sunrise and at sunset &c &c.'¹ Two days later Coleridge set off with the Wordsworths on the walking tour which saw the birth of *The Ancient Mariner*. In October of the next year Southey, blind to the range and magnitude of Coleridge's success in solving the very problem with which Southey himself had struggled long and patiently, the problem which he undoubtedly helped Coleridge to clarify, reviewed *Lyrical Ballads* in the *Critical Review*. Of *The Ancient Mariner* he wrote: 'Many of the stanzas are laboriously beautiful; but in connection they are absurd and unintelligible. . . . We do not sufficiently understand the story to analyze it. It is a Dutch attempt at German sublimity.'² It remained for Lamb two years later to write to Wordsworth the most penetrating contemporary comment upon that great poem—a comment which is still valid.³

¹ *R.S.L.* ii. 137.

² *Critical Review*, October 1798. Wordsworth also disapproved of this review (*W.L.* i. 229-30); but his own grasp of *The Ancient Mariner* was not very comprehensive. He writes to Cottle on 24 June 1799: 'From what I gather it seems that The Ancient Mariner has upon the whole been an injury to the volume, . . . If the volume should come to a second edition I would put in its place some little things which would be more likely to suit the common taste' (*W.L.* i. 226-7).

³ *C.L.* i. 240. Cf. *ibid.* 136-7 and De Quincey's statement in his 'Reminiscences' [*Works*, ed. Masson (Edin., 1889), ii. 138-9]. It is not clear how fully Coleridge himself

III

The only means Southey and Coleridge had of financing their removal to America was their pens. We shall not discuss here the details and peculiar intimacy of their poetic collaboration, but turn to a matter more lucrative for the Pantisocrats and more problematical for the biographer—the Bristol lectures of 1795.

The Library registers do not help to determine the date of Southey's journey to fetch Coleridge from the 'Angel' inn in London to meet his obligations in Bristol. We know from Southey's letters that he had not left by 5 January 1795, and by that date apparently had no definite plan of going to London. There are two gaps in his Library transactions—one of three weeks in January, and one of a month between January and February. All we can do is accept the tradition that Coleridge arrived in Bristol towards the end of January 1795. Soon after his arrival he started to lecture.

The details of the lectures given in Bristol by Coleridge and Southey have never been extricated, and recent biographers have been content to give a summary based on Cottle's account, with the suggestion that Coleridge probably did not give as many lectures as Cottle says he did.¹ It is seldom safe to accept Cottle's evidence without question; yet the quantity of evidence he produces for the Bristol lectures and the dogmatic tone with which he offers it has tended to obscure the less voluminous but more reliable evidence of Coleridge and Southey themselves. The problem of the Bristol Lectures is to decide how many of the lectures enumerated by Cottle were actually delivered. Coleridge said that he gave eleven lectures; we shall bear this number in mind while we explore Cottle's account in more detail.

All three of Coleridge's first lectures were, according to Cottle, double lectures; and all three were published. The first lecture—'written at one sitting between the hours of twelve at night and the Breakfast Time of the day, on which it was delivered'—had to be published to meet a charge of treason, and appeared in February under the title *A Moral and Political Lecture, delivered at Bristol*.² The lecture 'On the Present War' followed, and in November was printed with the first lecture under the title *Conciones ad Populum*. The third lecture, *The Plot Discovered*, was printed separately in November 1795.³ Cottle dates the first lecture at the end of January,

appreciated the magnitude of his achievement in this poem. I incline to the view that his great epic on the origin of evil was never written because as time went on he came to realize that he had already embodied his epic theme in *The Ancient Mariner*.

¹ Joseph Cottle, *Early Recollections* (London, 1837), pp. 13-19; *Reminiscences* (London, 1847), pp. 25-6. There is no substantial difference between the two versions.

² *U.L.* i, 31.

³ The original paper wrapper of this pamphlet bore the title *A Protest against certain Bills*. It is so advertised, with *The Watchman* and *Conciones*, at the end of *Poems on Various*

the second 'the latter end of February', but leaves the third indeterminate. Coleridge's Preface to *Conciones*, dated 16 November 1795, states that 'The two following addresses were delivered in the month February, 1795, and were followed by six others in defence of natural and revealed religion'. An undated letter to George Dyer, of the latter half of February, speaks of the delivery of three lectures and the printing of one of them. If the first lecture was given in February (as Coleridge claimed), all three belong in February. Coleridge's Library borrowings, beginning on 2 March 1795, give no clues to the dates of these lectures. A fourth lecture was projected, but was never delivered, possibly because of the attack of rheumatic fever mentioned in a second undated letter to George Dyer, written about 10 March just when Southey's Historical Lectures were about to begin.

Cottle prints the syllabus of Southey's course of twelve Historical Lectures, with slight variations from the original and with no indication of dates. A copy of the printed prospectus, with the date of each lecture, is preserved in the Bodleian Library.¹ The lectures were delivered twice a week, on Tuesdays and Fridays, starting on 14 March (Saturday) and ending officially on 21 April, but actually on 24 April through Coleridge's failure to deliver the fourth lecture. Southey's borrowings, and to a certain extent Coleridge's, run parallel to the subjects announced in the prospectus, but suggest that details were altered as the course developed. These were Southey's only Bristol lectures. As it was, they absorbed so much time that on 9 May he writes: 'My Lectures are finished and that very quietly. I gave thirteen—and said bolder truths than any other Man in this country has yet ventured. . . . My Lectures have occupied so much time that I have written little else.'²

It is convenient at this point to draw attention again to Coleridge's statement in the letter of 13 November 1795—that long, patient, and at times cold-blooded recitation of grievances which (if delivered normally) must have reached Southey on the eve of his wedding. 'My own lectures I wrote for myself, eleven in number, excepting a very few passages which most reluctantly you eked out for me. And such pages! I would not have suffered them to have stood in a lecture of yours. To *your* lectures I dedicated my whole mind and heart, and wrote one half in *quantity*; but in *quality* you must be conscious that all the *tug* of brain was mine, and that your share was little more than transcription.' This account may well be

Subjects (1796). Allibone records only this title, disregarding the title—*The Plot Discovered*—which is now regarded as standard.

¹ Bodleian MS. Autogr. b. 7, f. 9. Southey's lectures were also advertised in *Felix Farley's Bristol Journal* of 14 March. No announcement of any of Coleridge's lectures appeared either in *Felix Farley* or in *Bonner and Middleton's Bristol Journal*—presumably because his lectures were not, like Southey's, 'Unconnected with the Politics of the Day'.

² Add. MS. 30927, ff. 5-6.

one-sided: but it is written to the only other person who really knew how the lectures had been prepared and there must be a good deal of truth in it.¹ The most interesting detail is the acknowledged intimacy of their collaboration. In July 1797 Southey claimed that his effort had been the greater in the Bristol collaboration: 'I supported myself, and almost [Coleridge], I may say, for what my labours earned were as four to one. I gave lectures, I wrote indefatigably. . . .'² But those words were not written to Coleridge, and they were written two years after the lectures had been given. We must, then, try to discover which were Coleridge's eleven lectures.

Cottle assigns far more than eleven lectures to Coleridge. We have accounted for three in February. If we follow Coleridge's account in the Preface to *Conciones* rather than Cottle's statement, we find that the next lectures were those 'in defence of natural and revealed religion'. Cottle reprints the prospectus of six lectures 'on Revealed Religion, its Corruptions, and its Political Views', but without dates. These Theological Lectures won the friendship of John Prior Estlin, and in 1796 Coleridge considered preparing them for publication.³ The Library list shows that he was reading parallel to the syllabus between 13 April and about 11 June. If we assume that Coleridge was not lecturing at the same time as Southey, and that the Theological Lectures were delivered once a week in the same way that he proposed to deliver his Political Lectures, the Theological Lectures would have started either on 28 April or on 5 May.

On 16 June Coleridge delivered a lecture on the Slave Trade: Cottle reprints the notice with the date.⁴ Cottle mentions a lecture on the Hair Powder Tax but is vague about the date. According to Cottle the substance of this lecture was repeated as a sermon in Bath in January 1796.⁵ E. H. Coleridge states (I know not on what authority) that a lecture on the Corn Laws was delivered in Bath, on a date not specified.⁶

We now have a total of eleven lectures delivered in *Bristol*: three in

¹ L. i. 149. In a Harvard copy of *Conciones* (19476.305.2) Coleridge cancelled pp. 22-3, with the signed comment: 'Written by Southey. I never saw these men.' For another example of close collaboration see Lowes's note on the *G.M.B.* entry *Εραστου Γαληνος. άτ, Xanadu*, pp. 604 a-b. Again, in Bod. MS. (A), f. 149 (May 1795) Southey writes out an unpublished poem of four three-line alliterative stanzas, headed 'The Soldier's Wife/ Written with Coleridge'. Southey had been reading *Piers Plowman* and gives the direction: 'read this aloud & accent it'. The versification is not a true stressed rhythm, but a free syllabic scansion settling into a coarse dactylic movement. If this is the first step towards the prosody of *Christabel* it shows none of the limpid flexibility and inevitable shapeliness of that poem's line.

² R.S.L. i. 41.

³ B.E. i. 66; L. i. 157.

⁴ The lecture was printed in *The Watchman*, no. 4.

⁵ J. Cottle, *Early Recollections*, i. 179. The Hair Powder Tax was imposed on 7 May 1795, and notices of it appeared in the Bristol papers on 9 May and for some days following. Hanson's statement (op. cit., p. 83) that Poole contributed something to Coleridge's lecture suggests that the lecture may have been delivered rather later than early May.

⁶ L. i. 139 n.

February, six in May-June, and two isolated ones—the Slave Trade and probably the Hair Powder Tax—in June.

Cottle mentions 'three anti-Pittite lectures', no date suggested: his memory may simply have duplicated the three double lectures of February which were very definitely anti-Pittite. But more serious to account for is the course of six Political Lectures—on 'a comparative view of the English Rebellion under Charles the First, and the French Revolution'. Again Cottle reprints the prospectus. A copy of this prospectus has been preserved.¹ The lectures were to be delivered 'once a week; on Tuesday Evenings', starting on 23 June. But the Library registers give no indication that Coleridge lectured at all after the Slave Trade lecture on 16 June. Cottle's statement that the Theological Lectures 'succeeded' the Political Lectures simply will not fit into the evidence unless his 'Political Lectures' are the three separate lectures delivered in February. I suggest that the Political Lectures, despite the printed and dated prospectus, were cancelled at the last moment and were never delivered.²

IV

After Coleridge's Library borrowings begin, library transactions occur several times for both men on the same date, though only twice do both sign their own entries on the same day (Borrowings 41-2, 47-8; 23 March, 13 April 1795). Eleventh June is the last occasion on which entries appear for both on the same date. Southey's unsociability had been steadily increasing under the pressure of his love for Edith Fricker, his deepening anxiety for the fortunes of his own and the Fricker families. His letters show that by the middle of May he was morose, solitary, exhausted, and perplexed, and that Coleridge was having to apply 'the medicine of argument to [his] misanthropical system of indifference'.³ A heavy blow fell on 15 June, when Southey received a letter informing him that his friend Edmund Seward had died on 10 June:⁴ the effect on him was such that he

¹ Add. MS. 35343, f. 71. Coleridge has written an undated invitation to Poole in doggerel verse on the back of the printed prospectus. The verse is printed, with slight variations from the original, in *Poems*, ii. 978.

² The second lecture was to be on 'The Liberty of the Press'. There is a quotation from Milton's *Areopagitica* in *G.M.B.* (f. 14^v; and cf. ff. 12^v, 13-13^v, 16, 19). The contemporary account of Southey and Coleridge as lecturers, in *The Observer* [Bristol, 1795?], has not been reprinted in full. All known copies (3) are in the Bristol Library.

³ Bod. MS. (A), f. 151^v.

⁴ R.S. i. 240-1. An unpublished Southey letter in the Harvard Library, dated 16 November 1818, reads in part: '[Seward's] death in the year 1795 was the first severe affliction that I ever experienced—and sometimes even now I dream of him and wake myself by weeping because even in my dreams I remember that he is dead. I loved him with 'all' my whole heart, 'and nothing' and shall remember him with gratitude and affection as 'my o' one who was my moral father to the last moment of my life.—' [Words in half brackets deleted in MS.]

could vividly recall the incident more than twenty years later. At the beginning of July he considers that 'a man has no right to gloom a company with his melancholy feelings'; he hoped to be with Bedford in a fortnight but did not go.¹ What little effort he could stir out of the dead-level of his apathy he devoted to Edith and *Joan of Arc*. Meanwhile Coleridge was working on *Joan of Arc*, preparing his own and Southey's poems for joint publication—a project which never matured though far advanced at the time of their quarrel—and no doubt nursing the dying fires of Pantisocracy, a difficult task in view of Southey's silence and frequent absences. On 20 August Coleridge rented the Clevedon cottage in anticipation of his marriage, and on the 22nd Southey writes with enthusiasm of the poems they have been preparing together.² At about this time the storm, for weeks threatening, broke in Coleridge's outraged surprise that Southey could even consider abandoning Pantisocracy in favour of an undertaking with his uncle. The month drew on, perhaps waiting to see *Joan of Arc*, Book IV, through the press, perhaps in efforts at reconciliation. But on 1 September Southey left 25 College Street for Bath, Burnett went home, and Coleridge may have moved to other lodgings.³

During the next two and a half months the two poets seldom met and relations were distinctly cool. Coleridge married Sarah Fricker on 4 October and took his wife, with Burnett and Martha Fricker, on a Pantisocratic honeymoon to Clevedon. Southey married Edith Fricker on 14 November and immediately set off for Portugal alone. Coleridge's long epitaph on Pantisocracy, written to Southey on 13 November, shows how serious that undertaking had been; and behind the cold indignation of the letter there are still many traces of justice and gentleness to show that their collaboration was based upon something more substantial than theoretical idealism.

¹ Bod. MS. (A), f. 154.

² Ibid., f. 158^v.

³ Cottle's statement that Southey and Coleridge shared lodgings in both 48 and 25 College Street has never been unravelled. Southey twice dates a letter from 25 College Street in May 1795 (Add. MS. 30927, ff. 5-6; Bod. MS. (A), f. 149); and in his voluminous correspondence with Grosvenor Bedford there is no suggestion of a move until he left for Bath on 1 September. If, as Hanson suggests, Coleridge moved to 48 College Street *after* Southey had left he cannot have been there for long; he had rented the Clevedon cottage on 20 August, he was with Poole in Stowey 'for a few days' around 21 September, and was married on 4 October. A definite address is difficult to dismiss: but Cottle may have mistaken the circumstances. Mrs. Coleridge and the two younger children stayed with friends in Bristol from the end of March 1807. S. T. C. and Hartley joined her in May. At the beginning of June Sarah addresses a letter to Poole from 'College Street' [J. D. Campbell, *Life* (London, 1894), p. 158; Add. MS. 34344, f. 14]. Cottle in 1835 admitted to Poole that 'an intervention of *forty years*! has weakened my recollection of the order of some of the events' of the Bristol-Stowey period (Add. MS. 34344). I suggest that the Coleridges lodged at 48 College Street in 1807; and that Cottle, finding a record of this address among his papers, wrongly ascribed it to 1795. No. 25 College Street has been demolished: No. 48 bears a memorial plaque incorrectly dated.

Probably in September, Coleridge had met Wordsworth—the man whose poems he had read with approval in the summer of 1793, the poet beside whom Coleridge was later to feel himself ‘a little man’. Restless months of struggle with the twin giants, Bread and Cheese, were to pass before the fruition of the deep threefold friendship and the creation of inimitable poetry. A rhythm—of action, gestation, creation, exhaustion—first manifested at Cambridge begins clearly to establish itself. When he leaves Southey in Bristol, Coleridge is closing the second cycle of the mounting rhythm. The third will begin at the turn of the year and carry him through a creative movement he was never to repeat. Coleridge returned later to Bristol; to lecture, to be miserable, to be saved from despair by the devotion of his friends, to struggle with a broken will, a threatening obsession, a fading imagination. When Southey left Bristol for Greta Hall in 1803 he said: ‘The place is haunted, and it is my wish never to see it again.’ For Coleridge, Bristol must always have remained haunted. *Christabel* is charged with the fine tension of the *annus mirabilis*, set afire by the loving observation that could transmute images into symbols when ‘the Spring comes slowly up this way’. But its single heart-felt cry of personal anguish recalls Southey, the creative excitement of their first friendship never to be recovered, the bitterness of first disenchantment.

Alas! they had been friends in youth;
But whispering tongues can poison truth;
And constancy lives in realms above;
And life is thorny; and youth is vain;
And to be wroth with one we love
Doth work like madness in the brain.

They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
Like cliffs which had been rent asunder;
A dreary sea now flows between;—
But neither heat, nor frost, nor thunder,
Shall wholly do away, I ween,
The marks of that which once hath been.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

AN ENGLISH ALLUSION TO MONTAIGNE BEFORE 1595

In the year 1595 there appeared the posthumous 'definitive' edition of Montaigne's *Essais*, and on 20 October of that same year the 'Essais of Michael Lord Mountene', translated by Edward Aggas, were entered at the Stationers' Hall. This argues not only that Aggas wasted no time, but that there was already a public interested in the *Essais* in England at that date.¹ The late Pierre Villey stated 'qu'on lisait beaucoup Montaigne autour de Bacon, qu'on faisait grand cas de ses *Essais*, que l'opinion publique appelait impérieusement sur eux l'attention. Quand Florio eut publié sa traduction, en 1603, très vite Montaigne semble avoir été en Angleterre un écrivain d'une grande notoriété, d'une notoriété comparable à celle des Boccace et des Machiavel.' And in another place he pointed out that most educated Englishmen of the time read French 'et, suivant toute vraisemblance, c'est dans le texte français que l'œuvre de Montaigne fut révélée à Bacon'.² But it will be observed that these statements rest upon deductions as far as the period before the appearance of Florio's translation is concerned. True, the inference is obvious. Bacon first published his *Essays* in 1597. In 1600 Sir William Cornwallis published his, which, unlike Bacon's, are written in imitation of Montaigne's. He confessed that he had not studied the original, but was conversant with a translation circulating in manuscript for which he had high praise. This same year Florio's translation was licensed, though it was not to appear for three years more, and it is generally assumed that Cornwallis was referring to Florio. Miss Yates believes that he must have begun his translation at least by 1598.³ It is further to be noted that he referred with scorn to seven or eight abortive attempts by predecessors of his, amongst whom he seems to designate Edward Aggas. Such, in brief, is the position, and it is obvious that any direct allusion to Montaigne in England, before the appearance of Bacon's *Essays*, before even the French edition of 1595, would be of immense importance.

I think that such an allusion may exist, and one which is worth mentioning because, if there is anything in my suggestion, it would show that the *Essais* were already very well known in London, particularly in Gray's Inn,

¹ I wish to record my gratitude to Dr. Percy Simpson for kindly sparing time to glance through a draft of this note.

² Pierre Villey, 'Montaigne et François Bacon', *Revue de la Renaissance*, xi (1911), 132; 'Montaigne en Angleterre', *Revue des Deux Mondes*, xvii (1913), 119.

³ Sir Sidney Lee, *The French Renaissance in England* (Oxford, 1910), pp. 174-5; Frances A. Yates, *John Florio* (Cambridge, 1934), p. 213.

the Inn of Anthony and Francis Bacon. It would mean that Bacon, and the people who read him, must have known the 1588 edition, in which the Third Book of *Essais* first appeared, almost by heart. It would be worth being on the look-out for corroborative evidence.

Though it is true that Montaigne's *Essais* were popular from the moment they appeared, not necessarily, as Mademoiselle de Gournay complained, for the right reasons, the Third Book achieved less popularity than the earlier ones, and the author was not universally beloved by his French contemporaries. But their complaints spring from the nature of controversies long since dead, from peevish jealousy or from a lack of a sense of humour.¹ It would not, however, be altogether surprising if in England legitimate, light-hearted fun was being poked at one of the best and most justly famous of the *Essais* almost during Montaigne's lifetime.

In 1688 the Gray's Inn Christmas Revels of 1594-5 were published, and they are now easily accessible in Dr. W. W. Greg's Malone Society Reprint issued in 1915. These Revels are chiefly interesting for their connexion with the *Comedy of Errors*, and for the reason that Francis Bacon may have written some of the speeches. Perhaps that is why a possible allusion to Montaigne has been overlooked.

The Prince of the Revels was Mr. Henry Helmes, and after various mock proclamations a king-of-arms proceeded to read out the rules of 'the most honourable Order of Knighthood of the Helmet'. These rules remain a pattern of riotously funny parody. The mixture of pompous technicalities and incongruous topical allusions could hardly be bettered, but then it must have been prepared by the hand of a master. Amongst the rules occurs the following (p. 29):

Item, Every Knight of this Order shall endeavour to add Conference and Experience by Reading; and therefore shall not only read and peruse *Guizo*, the French Academy, *Galiatto* the Courtier, *Plutarch*, the *Arcadia*, and the Neoterical Writers, from time to time; but also frequent the Theatre, and such like places of Experience; and resort to the better sort of Ord'naries for Conference, whereby they may not only become accomplished with Civil Conversations, and able to govern a Table with Discourse; but also sufficient, if need be, to make Epigrams, Emblems, and other Devices appertaining to his Honour's learned Revels.

The passage is an obvious skit on one of the subjects of conversation of the day, the education of the *honnête homme*; a wilful distortion of the picture of the *école du monde*. It is, I believe, topical from start to finish, and not only in the list of books. The list has suffered at the printer's hands. *Guizo* stands for Stefano Guazzo, whose *Civile Conversation* was

¹ P. Villey, *Montaigne devant la postérité* (Paris, 1935), and A. M. Boase, *The Fortunes of Montaigne* (London, 1935).

translated into English by George Pettie and Bartholomew Young, and published in 1586. The *French Academy* of Pierre de la Primaudaye (the italics have gone wrong) was translated by Thomas Bowes in 1586. Robert Peterson published in 1576 a translation of Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo*, here transformed into *Galiatto* and given, as usual at this date, the title of Castiglione's *Courtier*, which had itself been translated by Thomas Hoby in 1561. In this context 'Plutarch' probably refers to some English translation. Sir Thomas North's *Lives* were published in 1579, but Sir Thomas Elyot had already published *The Education or Bringing up of Children* and other fragments about 1535. Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, published in 1590, is the most recent book in the list. The books were just what everybody was reading to learn manners. The rest of the rule, with its reference to 'neoterical writers', springs from current comment on the subject, and the idea of learning by experience was in the air all around. To encourage resort to the theatre, as a place of experience, is a harmless and comical exaggeration of the idea that the drama is a school of morals, touched upon by Montaigne, amongst others, in *De l'Institution des Enfants*. It has no obvious source. The same is not perhaps true of the precept which follows. 'L'incomparable auteur de l'art de conférer' began the eighth essay of his third book with the words: 'C'est un usage de nostre justice, d'en condamner aucuns pour le seul exemple des autres.' Here is something to tickle the palate of men of law. When he went on to say: 'L'estude des livres, c'est un mouvement languissant et foible qui n'eschauffe point: là où la conference apprend et exerce en un coup', he said something to rejoice the hearts of students of any period. And when he added: 'Voit-on plus de barbouillage au caquet des harangeres qu'aux disputes publiques des hommes de cette profession? J'aimeroiy mieux que mon fils apprinst aux tavernes a parler, qu'aux escholes de la parlerie', he issued a standing invitation to the young gentlemen whom a few generations later Roger North was sarcastically calling 'polite sparks', to substitute an evening at a tavern for attendance at a Moot. I submit that it is possible that this allusion is topical, that it was making fun of something which was being discussed in the Inns of Court and perhaps even at the Court itself, and that from this ferment Francis Bacon may have distilled his epigram 'Conference maketh a ready man'.—Francis Bacon, whose brother Anthony had met Montaigne, and been in residence at Gray's Inn in 1594 and was acquainted with Francis Davison, one of the authors of the Revels. The word 'conference', which does not occur in any of the books mentioned, and which belongs so particularly to Montaigne in this sense, points the way.

The French have a word *entregent*, for which no satisfactory equivalent exists in English, and yet it is only in England that the kind of education

idealized by Montaigne has ever been transformed into a system. It would be characteristic if in England they dared to find the taverns funny. In France, they seem to have been quietly dropped as a piece of intolerable vulgarity or misplaced humour. In the next century Molière's *Ariste* speaks of female education in his famous speech (*L'École des Maris*, I. ii), but in any case *l'école du monde* has been refined away to merely

les belles compagnies,
Les divertissemens, les bals, les comédies.

Only the idea of travel as a means of education, which is developed, be it noted, in the first book of *Essais*, gained general currency. There had once been a reason besides whimsicality for the taverns. Montaigne was rushing to his country's defence, stung by something which he had found in his principal source, Guazzo's *Civile Conversation* [Chappuys's translation (Lyons, 1580), p. 64]: 'Vous ne me dites pas chose nouvelle: mais vous ne devez non plus vous émerveiller de voir ceux là iouer à tels ieux, en plaine rue, que de voir les François boire, comme i'entens, aux tauernes.' The English, who have always found in Montaigne what Gonzague Truc has called in a recent book 'une certaine convenance avec cette sorte d'humeur du pays qu'on appelle humour',¹ may have missed the point too, may have answered whimsicality with whimsicality, and contented themselves with the deliciously humorous attenuation of the blunt taverns into the more genteel 'better sort of Ord'naries' as the training-ground for the courtly banquet into which the Platonic symposium had degenerated.²

No one had a better right than members of the Inns of Court to make fun of the kind of education which had, in fact, been practised there for centuries. It would be a pleasant relief, indeed, to catch laughing at themselves those paragons produced by a system whose praises Sir John Fortescue had sung in extravagant terms:³

So that there is scarce to be found, thro'out the Kingdom, an eminent Lawyer, who is not a Gentleman by Birth and Fortune; consequently they have a greater Regard for their Character and Honour than those who are bred in another Way. There is both in the *Inns of Court*, and the *Inns of Chancery*, a sort of an *Academy*, or *Gymnasium*, fit for Persons of their Station; where they learn Singing, and all Kinds of Music, Dancing and such other Accomplishments and Diversions (which are called *Revels*), as are suitable to their Quality, and such as are usually practised at Court.

M. DOMINICA LEGGE

¹ *Montaigne* (Paris, 1945), p. 149.

² It is worth noticing here that Guazzo's fourth book includes the 'example of a Banquet' with a conversation between six Lords and four Ladies.

³ *De Laudibus Legum Angliae*, ch. xlix, anonymous translation.

A NOTE ON *HENRY V* ACT IV

Dr. Dover Wilson, in his Cambridge edition of *Henry V* (p. 116), suggests that iv. i. 35-284 is an interpolation made by Shakespeare as a partial compensation for the Falstaff scenes which were cut out of the play when Will Kemp left the company. This passage contains the beginning of the quarrel between the King and Williams which ends in the exchange of gloves; the finish of the 'glove episode' (iv. vii. 117-viii. 73) must therefore, if we accept Dr. Dover Wilson's arguments, be another interpolation.

This second part of the 'glove episode' is introduced (vii. 114-16) by the King when he commands the heralds to:

Bring me just notice of the numbers dead
On both our parts. Call yonder fellow hither.

Williams is brought to him, and the glove dispute continues without intermission until it ends with (viii. 72):

Fluellen. Your shoes is not so good: 'tis a good silling, I warrant you, or I will change it.

An English Herald returns from the battlefield.

King. Now, herald, are the dead numbered?

Dr. Dover Wilson's chief defence for his theory of interpolation in iv. i is that the King repeats his order that the nobles should be gathered at his tent, Erpingham each time being present (ll. 27, 283). The position in iv. vii and viii is surprisingly similar: the order is not repeated, but 137 lines elapse before the King's command to 'Bring me just notice of the numbers dead' is obeyed. This delay is undoubtedly realistic, but is dramatically questionable, for an audience would never connect the herald's return with the original carelessly given order. On the other hand, if we suppose that these 137 lines did not appear in the original play, a short interval allowing the herald to depart and return would then be desirable; possibly this interval was filled in with a little Falstaffian 'business', or with a short speech from the King.

In addition, the passage in the play as we now have it makes a long break in the solemnity of the victory scene. Comic relief has already been supplied by Fluellen, and more of it only destroys the atmosphere, making the scene a mere series of episodes.

It therefore seems reasonably certain that both passages were interpolations made by Shakespeare during a revision of the play. Dr. Dover Wilson gives even stronger reasons in defence of his theory that ii. i and ii. iii are also interpolations, making a total of something like 550 lines added during the revision. The scenes in Act II explain the reason for Falstaff's absence, but the interpolated Act IV scenes appear to serve no good dramatic purpose. We can only suppose that Shakespeare was unwilling to entrust a

long comic scene to an actor other than Kemp, that the comic scenes were accordingly shortened, and new matter added to compensate for them. Nevertheless, on balance, it appears probable that the original play was considerably shorter, but since the play as we now have it is a long one (over 3,300 lines), we need have no fears that the undiscovered original was too short ever to have existed.

ALLAN WILKINSON

DRYDEN'S FRENCH BORROWINGS

DRYDEN, says Dr. Johnson, 'had a vanity, unworthy of his abilities, to shew, as may be suspected, the rank of the company with whom he lived, by the use of French words, which had then crept into conversation; such as *fraicheur* for *coolness*, *fougue* for *turbulence*, and a few more, none of which the language has incorporated or retained. They continue only where they stood first, perpetual warnings to future innovators.'¹ Scott follows Johnson in claiming 'that, to comply probably with the humour of Charles, or from an affectation of the fashionable court dialect, the poet laureat employed such words as *fougue*, *fraicheur*, etc., instead of the corresponding expressions in English'. He adds, 'It will admit of question whether any single French word has been naturalised upon the sole authority of Dryden'.² Now for the introduction of *fraicheur* Dryden can hardly be blamed, as it is recorded at least twice before his time, in 1599 and 1647. For *fougue*, Dryden is our first authority, but, although the word has not survived to our day, it appears at least twice after *Astræa Redux* (1660)—in the *Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson* (c. 1665) and in the *Works* (1669) of Swift's patron, Sir William Temple. Clearly Johnson's pronouncement needs testing.

Careful reading of Dryden, with the *Oxford English Dictionary*³ at the elbow, produces the following list of French words (in the spelling of the early editions) which he was apparently the first to use: in *Astræa Redux* (1660), *fogue* (l. 203); in *The Wild Gallant* (1663), *Sixieme* (iv. 1); in *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (1668), *a propos* (Ker, i. 62), *Balette* (i. 74), *dupe* (i. 66), *embarrass* (i. 60), *mal a propos* (i. 58), *protatick* (i. 61); in *An Evening's Love* (1668), *brunette* (III. i), *coquette* (III. i), *incontestable* (IV. ii); in *Marriage à la Mode* (1673), *Beveue* (v. i), *Billets doux* (II. i), *Double-entendre* (III. i), *Esclaircissement/Eclaircissement* (III. i, v. i), *fiercé* (II. i), *Foible* (III. i), *Levé* (II. i), *mal a droitley* (II. i), *mal a propos* (v. i), *Minouet* (II. i), *naïveté* (III. i, v. i), *panchant* (v. i), *ridicule* (III. i), *raccommode* (v. i),

¹ *Lives of the Poets*, ed. Hill (Oxford, 1905), i. 463 f.

² *Works of Dryden* (ed. Scott, Saintsbury, Edinburgh, 1882), i. 521-2.

³ *Bejame, Quae e Gallicis verbis in Anglicam linguam Johannes Dryden introduxerit* (Paris, 1881), used Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*. Only about a quarter of his 200 examples stand, while his lists omit a number which the *O.E.D.* supports.

Sottise (III. i), *spirituelle* (III. i), *tendre* (III. i); in *The Kind Keeper* (1678), *nom de guerre* (I. i), *Party* 'a match in a game', i.e. *partie* (IV. ii), *Simagres* (III. i), *Tout* (IV. ii), *Vol* (IV. i); in *The Duke of Guise* (1682), *Louisdors* (IV. iii); in *Albion and Albanus* (1685), *chacon* (II); in *The Hind and the Panther* (1687), *fatigue* (II. 686); in *Don Sebastian* (1690), *Carte blanche* (III. ii); in the translation of *Juvenal* (1693), *console* (x. 191); in that of Du Fresnoy's *Art of Painting* (1695), *Groupe*; in the dedication to the *Aeneis* (1697), *epopee* (Ker, II. 160), *verve* (II. 216).

Eight of these occurrences are earlier than the first noted in the *O.E.D.*:

bévue, *brunette*, *carte blanche*, *dupe*, *embarrass*, *incontestable*, *louis d'or*.

In any case the evidence of the *O.E.D.* should be received with caution. Dryden is there the first authority for *naïveté*, yet the word is found in 1667 in a list of Evelyn's [*Memoirs* (ed. 1857), III. 161] of French words for which there are no English substitutes: *naïveté*, *ennui*, *bizarre*, *concert*, *emotion*, *defer*, *effort*. 'Let us therefore', he says, '... make as many of these do homage as are like to prove good citizens'. This of course does not prove that *naïveté* was already current. But, of Evelyn's other words, *ennui* is the only one which appears to be as novel as he thinks they all are; it is first found here, and does not appear to be naturalized till 1758, in Lord Chesterfield's *Letters*. For the rest, *bizarre* and *effort* have already been used unselfconsciously, the first by Lord Herbert of Cherbury in his *Life* (1648), the second by Denham in *The Passion of Dido* (1636) (and much earlier by Caxton); *concert* and *emotion* have been current from Elizabethan times (the former in the erroneous form *consort*—see *O.E.D.* s.v., sb.², 3); *defer* is well known from 1490. There may then be a probability that *naïveté* was already known and used.

Perhaps the same probability extends to other apparent innovations of Dryden's. Certainly these are a tiny minority of the total number of French words he uses. A bare fifth of Beljame's list now appear Dryden's own borrowings and it would seem probable that evidence exists of earlier occurrences of even this handful, for Dryden does appear to have been drawing on a 'fashionable dialect'. It is obviously ridiculed in the character of Melantha from whose lines so many of this handful of words come; and those of her words which are previously recorded, appear to have been current among courtiers like Hobbes, who uses *grimace* (*Marriage à la Mode*, II. i) in *Leviathan* (1651), or Cowley, who puts *chagrin* (II. i) into his *Pindaric Odes* in 1656, the same year as the word appears in Blount's *Glossographia*. The occurrence of Melantha's *Galeche* (II. i) in *The London Gazette* in 1666, or *caprice* (IV. iv) in Digby's *Elvira* (1667), or *ravissant* (II. i) in Bishop Gauden's ... *defence by way of apology ... for ... the Church of England*, or *entreprenant* (IV. iv) in the preface to Shadwell's

The Humorists (1671) (quoted in Summers's note to *Marriage à la Mode*, iv. iv), all seem to support the conclusion that Dryden was using, as well as satirizing, a fashionable dialect. The history of French words other than Melantha's in Dryden points the same way: *attitude* (Du Fresnoy's *Art of Painting*), *intendant* (*Dialogues of Lucian*), *lampoon* (*Secret Love*, iv. i, *Love Triumphant*, prologue, *Aeneis*, dedication), *pantaloons* (*Secret Love*, prologue), are all first quoted from Evelyn, *despotic* (*Sigismonda and Guiscardo*, l. 599) and *complaisance* (*An Evening's Love*, prologue) from Hobbes's *Leviathan*, *couchee* (*The Hind and the Panther*, l. 516), and *ruelle* (*Aeneis*, dedication) from Etherege's *Man of Mode*, and *brilliant* (sb.) (*The Good Parson*, l. 139), *ritornelle* (*Albion and Albanus*, l. 1), and *surtout* (*Juvenal*, 3rd satire, l. 250) from the *London Gazette*.

Returning to Melantha, who tells us most about the 'fashionable dialect', we find that some of the apparently fashionable words are not new to the language at all, though Dryden apparently thinks they are: *incendiary* Melantha takes up eagerly from her maid in III. i, but it has been current since 1606, just as *equivoque*, in the same scene, has since 1614; while *conversation* and *voyage*, which first lead Palamede to think his mistress 'one of those who run mad in new French words', have been in use from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries respectively. On the other hand, *embarrass*, one of Melantha's favourites, seems new enough for Dryden to have found it necessary five years before, in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (Ker, i. 60), to explain it: 'they do not embarrass or cumber themselves with too much plot'. *Diction* (see below), the only other word of which Dryden gives this kind of explanation, is to be found in English over a hundred years before his time, and even the sense in which he believes he is using the word is not entirely new. He may feel with *embarrass* that he is using, not a strange word, but a known one in a new sense. All told, the evidence of the *O.E.D.*, though not to be set aside, is unavoidably incomplete and so takes little from the strength of the indications that Dryden is less an innovator than an imitator of the fashion.

If, however, a likely French source can be found for Dryden's word, direct borrowing may seem probable. This is possible at least for the words *incontestable* and *protatic* and the semantic borrowing *tender*, 'tender feelings' (*An Evening's Love*, v. i). The first and the last of these both occur in a play commonly recognized to owe something to Molière's *Les Précieuses Ridicules*, and in phrases which, coming from Aurelia, echo Molière's Cathos, one of the *précieuses* upon whom Scott suggested Aurelia was modelled:¹ *Incontestable truth* (*An Evening's Love*, iv. ii) corresponds to *une vérité incontestable* (scène ix); and 'the furious tender which I have for him' (*An Evening's Love*, v. i) to 'J'ai un furieux tendre pour les hommes

¹ Op cit. iii. 237.

d'épée' (scène xi). *Protatic* in the phrase *protatic persons* comes, as Ker's note makes probable, from *personnage protatique* in Corneille (*Examen de Rodogune*). Against these must be set *double entendre* which appears to have no French source at all. Littré's only quotation (in his supplement) is from 1688, much later than *Marriage à la Mode*. Either Dryden made it up, or, again, fashionable speech in England supplied it to him.

But there is an interesting group of words already in the language which Dryden uses with French meanings or constructions. Some of these are apparently peculiar to him. He alone seems to use *escapade* of a horse's fit of plunging and rearing; 'His fiery Arab . . . sprung loose and flew into an Escapade' (*The Conquest of Granada*, Pt. 1, 1670); cp. Littré:

Terme de ménage. Action subite d'un cheval qui s'emporte et refuse d'obéir à son cavalier.

Dryden is the only *O.E.D.* authority for *shock* in the sense 'to run counter to, to oppose':

That monarch sits not safely on his Throne

Who bears, within, a power that shocks his own;

(*The Indian Emperor*, I. ii)

Advise him not to shock a father's will;

(*Aureng-zebe*, II)

Littré gives a number of comparable seventeenth-century quotations; e.g.:

De notre Sparte il choquera les lois (Corneille, *Agésilas*, II. vi)

Vous prétendez choquer ce que je dis (Molière, *Le Festin*, v. iii).

An instance which the *O.E.D.* does not record, but which survives in Pope, is the use of *violence* to denote 'fervour of prayer':

Hail son of prayers! by holy violence

Drawn down from Heaven;

(*Britannia Rediviva*, 35)

Verse prays for peace, or sings down Pope or Turk

The silenced preacher yields to potent strain,

And feels the grace his pray'r besought in vain;

The blessing thrills through all the labouring throng,

And heaven is won by violence of song.

(*Imitations of Horace*, First Epistle of the Second Book, ll. 236 ff.)

This seems clearly Littré's sixth meaning: 'Ardeur incessante de la dévotion', e.g. 'Sa grâce [God's] est le prix de la seule violence' (Massillon, *Petit Carême*, Prière 2). Perhaps the explanation is to be found in *Astræa Redux*, 142 ff.:

repeated prayer

Which stormed the skies and ravished Charles from thence

As Heaven itself is took by violence

and the quotation of Matthew xi. 12 in Christie's note: 'And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence,

and the violent take it by force.' But Pope's use, and both of Dryden's, seem to involve some quibble on the French meaning. We find first in Dryden, but to-day no longer, *mennage* (i.e. *ménage*) in the sense of *l'économie domestique* in *Marriage à la Mode*, II. i, and not the previous sense of 'household'. The verb *manage*, too, takes on a new sense in the Dedication of the *Aeneis*—'how a tragedy should be contrived and managed'; one of the senses of the French verb is, and was, 'disposer avec art'. In translating Du Fresnoy, Dryden gives the existing word *chromatick* (sb.) the sense of the French *chromatique*, 'the art of colouring'.

The rest of the semantic borrowings I have noted have permanently affected the language. Dryden is the first to extend the meaning of *fond* (current in the sense 'foundation') to include the other French meaning of 'source of supply, store': 'Here, therefore, if they will Criticise, they shall do it out of their own *Fond*' (*Albion and Albanus*, Preface). Swift takes up this meaning in *The Tale of a Tub* (vii) and it infects, as early as 1694, the cognate *fund*. It is in Dryden that *gallant* first means 'amatory' (*Marriage à la Mode*, III. i), and the verb *to contrast* 'to put in contrast' (Du Fresnoy) instead of, as hitherto, 'to resist'. The word *diction* he is careful to explain: '... in every part of his diction, or (to speak English) in all his expressions' (Preface to *Sylvae*, ed. Ker, i. 266); 'diction, that is the choice of words and harmony of numbers' (Preface to *Fables*, Globe ed., p. 496). The *O.E.D.* records this as a new sense but it appears deducible from Sidney's *Apologie* where diction is 'the out-side of [poesie] ... which is words' and is damned in these terms: 'So is that honny-flowing Matron Eloquence, apparelled ... in affectation: one time with so farre fette words, they may seem Monsters. . .'.¹ *Garniture* means 'furniture, appurtenances' in the sixteenth century and is applied, in the *O.E.D.* quotation from 1582, even to 'pannes, caudrons and other garnitures of the kitchen'. Dryden specializes it in the primary French sense of 'ornament, trimming': 'A man of garniture and feather is above the dispensation of the sword' (*Secret Love*, v. i). This, too, remains in use. Although he alone uses *reprise* as equivalent to *reprisal* (*Secret Love*, v. i; *The Hind and the Panther*, iii. 862; *Ovid's Metamorphoses*, xii. 319), he also introduces a correct French meaning which survives till the end of the nineteenth century: 'The last two lines are sung by Reprises, betwixt Aug. & Tham.' (*Albion and Albanus*, I. i). And *douceurs* (already current, in the singular, in the sense 'amiability, gentleness') which is first used by Dryden to mean, as the French plural does, 'pleasant, complimentary speeches' (*Marriage à la Mode*, v. i) is later recorded by the *O.E.D.* in 1726 and 1807.

Finally there are a number of Gallicisms of idiom and syntax. In 'The fierce young king the entered does attack' (*Conquest of Granada*, Pt. 2, v. ii)

¹ Ed. Arber (English Reprints), p. 68.

the past-participial adjective stands as a noun on the model of French *les entrés*. Certain verbs like *profit* and *reimburse* take French constructions apparently for the first time in Dryden:

You might have found a mercenary son

To profit of the battles he had won.

(*Aureng-zebe*, II. i)

You'll find occasion instantly to reimburse me of my kindness.

(*The Assignment*, v. iii)

The first construction is later found in Burke and Meredith (*Harry Richmond*: 'quick to profit of a crisis'); the second does not seem recorded after 1790. Melanthes's 'He mocks himself of me' falls here too, but is plainly meant to sound foreign. On the other hand, the constructions with *profit* and *reimburse* may have been introduced earlier, and be revealed by wider reading, for the other Gallicisms in the note to the Globe edition of the *Poetical Works*, p. 39, 'prevail myself of' (*Annus Mirabilis*, Preface; *Absalon and Achitophel*, 461) and 'provide yourself of' (*Love Triumphant*, IV. i) appear to have been in use at least since 1617 (Moryson, *An Itinerary*, II. 234 '... to prevail the Garrisons of some Corne') and 1547 (Boorde, *Introduction to Knowledge*, xiv (1870), 160 '... good townes, provided of vitels'). There seems no other example, however, of the phrase *by moments* (*Britannia Rediviva*, 237) or of Dryden's use of *render* with accusative of the thing and dative of the person: 'To render us his timely friendship vain;' (*Annus Mirabilis*, 8) cp. Bossuet, *Bourgoing*: 'La mortification lui rend la mort familière.' Dryden is the first of the two authors quoted in the *O.E.D.* as using the dative infinitive with *to* dependent on *arrive* in the sense 'to attain to': 'You have learn'd the advantages of Play, and can arrive to live upon't' (*Marriage à la Mode*, I. i). It is no doubt impossible to prove that Dryden is the first to use all these or that they are the result of first-hand acquaintance with French. At least they show him using French, not to gain a laugh at the expense of fashions in speech, but to express his own meaning.

Johnson's pronouncement, then, seems at the moment to stand examination. Without a full seventeenth-century dictionary and grammar we cannot be sure that Dryden himself was responsible for the borrowing of any words, meanings, or constructions from the French. Except in a few instances which can be traced to French sources (the words *incontestable* and *protatic*, and the meaning of the noun *tender*), and perhaps in the few which seem peculiar to him, there appears, rather, a strong probability that his Gallicisms are those 'which had then crept into conversation'. On only one point is Johnson to be corrected. Most of the French words in Dryden—and these are Johnson's concern—have been found useful. Few 'continue only where they stood first, perpetual warnings to future innovators'.

E. A. HORSMAN

REVIEWS

Anglo-Saxon Magic. By G. STORMS. Pp. xiv + 336. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1948. 14 guilders.

The author of this book seems to have had two aims: to write a treatise on Anglo-Saxon magic and to provide a new edition of the Anglo-Saxon charms. In trying to achieve both tasks within the covers of a single book, he has failed to achieve either task satisfactorily. It would seem that Dr. Storms is chiefly interested in the first of these aims, since he declares (p. 26) that his primary purpose has been not to publish the texts but to analyse and explain them. It may well be, however, that the chief value of the book will be that it makes accessible the text of the charms. With the exception of fourteen Latin charms, they have all been published before, but the editions of Cockayne (*Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England*, 3 vols. 1864-6) and Grendon ['The Anglo-Saxon Charms', *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, xxii (1909), 105-237] are now not easy to obtain.

The introduction, which comprises rather more than one-third of the book, contains a general discussion of the nature of magic with illustrations from the Anglo-Saxon charms. The most valuable parts of the introduction are those which give specific consideration to the difficulties which are peculiar to the texts under discussion or which point out how far the texts throw light on Anglo-Saxon magical theory and practice. One may instance the author's collection of words to illustrate the complex meaning and varied application of the word *craft* (p. 37), and his inference that the existence of a detailed terminology about various aspects of magic strengthens the view that belief in magic was native among the Anglo-Saxons, since most of the terms are of native origin and are not borrowed from Latin or Greek (p. 114). But such passages are rare, and the introduction contains too many generalizations and speculations such as the guesses about the possible origins of the significance of the number three (pp. 96 f.). The whole book suffers from repetitiveness and a tendency to labour the obvious, for example, '... nothing can save the victim. His doom is certain, his fate is sealed' (p. 31).

The chief fault of the book is that the author shows little ability to select: clarity is sacrificed to exhaustiveness. This fault is especially noticeable in Chapter IV, 'Structure and Atmosphere of the Ritual'. In this chapter quotations are given from the charms to illustrate the popularity of various themes. The same quotations are repeated under various headings and the effect is tedious and confusing. Thus the same quotation from the charm 'Wip Blæce' (No. 6) occurs under the headings Animistic Elements (p. 52), Running water (p. 74), Time (p. 88), Silence (p. 94), and Numbers (p. 97). This analysis would have been more helpful if it had been less minute; the reader loses sight of the main points in a welter of documentary evidence.

Probably Chapter V, 'Borrowing or Tradition', will be found the most generally useful. Here Dr. Storms endeavours to separate the three strands

interwoven in the fabric of the charms, the classical, Germanic, and Christian elements. In this chapter the author seems to suffer from a curious uncertainty about the value of the evidence at his disposal. The first argument which he uses leads us to think that evidence must be very scarce: 'The existence of magic in Anglo-Saxon England can be inferred in general from the fact that not a single people has been discovered that does not use magic in some form or other' (p. 107). Yet there is plenty of evidence of the prevalence of magical practices in the frequent prohibitions included in the ecclesiastical and secular laws to which Dr. Storms refers (p. 114), and of which more might have been made. The author is conscious of the danger of using Icelandic evidence when discussing conditions in England. In view of the length of time during which the Anglo-Saxons and the Scandinavians were separated, the value of such evidence is, as he euphemistically terms it, 'a delicate matter' (p. 108). It is the more surprising that he repeatedly falls into the trap of assuming that Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon conditions were identical, as when he says, 'The mentality of the audience listening to the story of Grettir or to that of Beowulf must have been the same' (p. 109).

The introduction includes a short but valuable account of the formal characteristics of the charms and the differences between the verse charms and the rest of Anglo-Saxon poetry (pp. 118 f.). In view of the irregularity of the metre of the verse charms, Dr. Storms wisely refuses to emend the text purely on metrical grounds. The texts are accompanied by a translation and followed by interpretations which would be greatly improved by abridgement: they are too often padded out by a paraphrase of the translation which has already been given. Unfortunately the texts do not seem to be very accurate. There are many readings which are clearly erroneous,¹ and, when this is so, one can feel little confidence in the accuracy of the rest of the text. There are numerous misprints which do not affect the text but which reinforce the conclusion that the book would have been greatly improved if it had been more thoroughly revised before publication.

G. L. BROOK

Postscript on Beowulf. By S. O. ANDREW. Pp. viii+158. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. 16s. net.

This is an expansion and illustration of the ideas first put forward by Mr. Andrew in his *Syntax and Style in Old English* (1940). Limiting himself to *Beowulf*, he applies the views on the syntax of O.E. poetry which distinguish the latter half of his earlier work with greater thoroughness and assurance than was possible in so small a volume. To these matters, in the present rather larger work, are added some general considerations of the O.E. sentence and of parts of speech in verse, with chapters on 'The poet and his art', 'Stress in OE.', 'Postponed alliteration' (ideas first suggested in the same writer's *OE. Alliterative Measure*), and on 'Metrical criteria'. Finally there is an entirely new survey of

¹ For example, No. 4, l. 3, for *as* read *ac*; No. 6, l. 5, for *Ssearpa* read *Scearpa*; No. 8, l. 70, for *onne* read *þonne*; No. 9, l. 63, for *is* read *ic*; No. 10, l. 13, for *bonne* read *þonne*; No. 16, l. 4, for *bid* read *bið*.

what he regards as the correct way to approach the textual criticism of *Beowulf* in a chapter entitled 'Scribal error and its sources'. Besides a subject-index, a very useful index of first lines enables the student of *Beowulf* to refer instantly to anything Mr. Andrew may have to say on any particular passage.

In *Syntax and Style in Old English*, a prima-facie case had been made out that 'Speaking generally, a study of the prose and verse usage leads to the conclusion that the same rules hold for verse as for prose, both in syntax and word-order'. Doubts expressed by some reviewers on this conclusion led to the writing of this 'Postscript', which seeks to drive home the point with fuller argument, to separate what usages may properly be thought to be limited to verse, and to add the necessary further general matters so as to make the book as a whole a stimulating and admonitorial companion to the student or editor of *Beowulf*.

Mr. Andrew's classification of sentences from the point of view of function and word-order, and his demonstration that the whole question of the distinction between principal and subordinate sentences had never been properly worked out and must be thoroughly revised, were notable contributions to the neglected subject of O.E. syntax in general and to the interpretation of O.E. poetry in particular: so that it has been generally admitted that his *Style and Syntax in Old English* was a valuable pioneer work. It set scholars thinking along new and significant lines: and the suggestion that prose and verse had the same usages of syntax is one which fits well into a reasonable conception of O.E. as a human language in which the patterns of verse are a selection of emphasized prose rhythms felt to be suited to the dignity and purposes of poetry.

Generally speaking, Mr. Andrew makes out a convincing and well-argued demonstration in this volume, not only of the truth of his main contentions, but of their great value for the proper understanding of *Beowulf*, though there are many details in which some with perhaps a more specialized linguistic knowledge may differ from him. Moreover, his view that the punctuation commonly accepted by editors of *Beowulf* is often erroneous and in any case needs thorough overhauling, is of serious moment for the interpretation of some difficult passages and will have to be most carefully considered by all future editors of the poem.

The fundamental nature of the considerations adduced may be illustrated by the remark (p. 9): 'We may pause here for a few moments in order to assess the stylistic loss which the text of *Beowulf* suffers by the refusal of subordination, in all modern editions, to any *ð*a-clause which precedes the principal sentence.' For if Mr. Andrew is right in believing that many supposed principal clauses should be regarded as subordinate, and the text is re-punctuated accordingly, the style of very much of *Beowulf* will become smooth and continuous in impression where it now seems abrupt and at times disjointed. Consider, for example, *Beowulf*, ll. 321-31 (examined on pp. 9-10). If a comma replaces the period after *cwomon*, and *searwum* is made the end of a sentence, the style of this passage is smoothed and rendered continuous. The clause '*þa hie to sele furðum . . . gangan cwomon*' (323-4) becomes subordinate to a main clause '*Bugon þa to bence*' (327) and the translation may run 'As soon as they reached the hall, . . . they sat on the bench, etc.' Clearly style and syntax are inseparable. This kind of argument, which runs through Mr. Andrew's first six chapters, is perhaps not

capable of final proof. But it is strengthened by the metrical considerations brought forward as corroboration in Chapters VII to XI: and if it had to be accepted, the whole quality of the style and art of *Beowulf* would have to be viewed differently. Finally, too, in his last chapter, Mr. Andrew, by means of his syntactical and metrical criteria combined, would compel us to revise the text in a number of important passages so as to make it conform to these criteria.

It is in this last matter of textual criticism, for which the concluding chapter of the book somewhat rapidly and confidently lays down principles and examples, that scholars are likely to be least willing to accept Mr. Andrew's assured guidance. It is clearly right and salutary that we should be reminded of the value of applying syntactical as well as metrical considerations to the solution of textual problems in *Beowulf*; and it is true that syntax has generally been grossly neglected by editors. It is also true that the common types of scribal error set forth by Mr. Andrew are rightly explained by him. Again, it was a point well worth making that such words as *pa* and *per*, stressed when in principal clauses, would be less stressed if such clauses turned out to be subordinate, so that Sievers's scansion might have to be corrected because it was based in given instances on faulty stress derived from syntactical misconception. Yet it is also to be remembered that Mr. Andrew's view of the syntax of a selected clause (and his scansion based on this view) are not often proven, but remain as attractive possibilities; and, moreover, that there are considerations of dialect, palaeography, and historical grammar which he has not taken time always to allow for in his reconstructions. Certainly, if all Mr. Andrew's syntax and metre are accepted as data, it will follow that the poet of *Beowulf* must have intended all the passages here and elsewhere corrected exactly as emended. But without the enlarging and deepening of this, after all very brief, survey, we are scarcely in a position to ignore all considerations save those of hypothetical syntax and metre whenever these seem to agree against the manuscript. It is doubtful if the language of *Beowulf* had the relative regularity of syntax and metre of the best Classical Latin; and besides the matters mentioned above, there are sometimes points of archaeology, cultural history, or the genius of the language (its *Sprachgefühl*), which may throw light on the interpretation or emendation of a passage. A few points of detail may serve to illustrate the above cautions.

No reason is given for citing l. 985 of *Beowulf* as if Sedgfield's emendation *stiðnægla gehwylc* were the manuscript reading or else generally accepted. Clearly the assumption implied here (p. 98) cannot be the same as that stated on p. 4 (from which we should expect that all passages cited without variants were agreed by the four editors there listed). Incidentally, it may be suggested that to the editions of Holthausen, Klaeber, Sedgfield, and Wyatt-Chambers taken as the basis for this work, the new Heyne-Schücking as revised by Else von Schaubert (1940; reprinted, 1946) should have been added: for it contains several valuable textual points, e.g. on l. 457, which would affect Mr. Andrew's argument. In so definitely correcting Sievers's view of 'postponed alliteration' in Chapter X, there might have been some difference if Sievers's later work on *Schallanalyse* had been made use of.¹ The statement on p. 145 that the two

¹ e.g. *Ziele und Wege der Schallanalyse* (Heidelberg, 1924).

scribes of the *Beowulf* extant manuscript were working from a text which was 'perhaps itself a copy' seems very odd in the light of a good deal of evidence for several stages of textual transmission between the composition of the poem and its copying by the scribes of MS. Cott. Vit. A XV some three centuries later. On p. 96 the famous crux in l. 850 is resolved by stating that the manuscript *deaðfæge deog* should be read as *deaðfæge deop*, because 'The parallelism makes Sievers' *deop* quite certain' and because *fæge* 'is used only of persons'. Here, besides the palaeographical difficulties in the emendation, *deaðfæge* may well refer to Grendel and *deog* be the preterite of a verb meaning 'to die': for the regular verbal forms of *deþenn* in the *Ormulum* (which cannot satisfactorily be explained from O.N.) seem to point to the existence of an O.E. verb *degan* or *deogan* not otherwise recorded: and Grendel, 'doomed to death as he was, died' might be a possible rendering. The emendation of ll. 489-90 (p. 147) to read 'ond on sæl meotod / sigehgreð sele' seems to take little account of the fact that the scop sings at l. 496 and that we should naturally expect therefore that Beowulf is being asked to attend to the recitation of heroic deeds rather than to gain glory on the mede-bench (the emended version is rendered 'And may God in due time grant glory'). Here the manuscript reads in l. 490 *sige hreð secg* (the final *ū* as an abbreviation for *um* seen by Zupitza cannot now be made out, and this letter may well have been an 'open' *a* or a *u* miscopied from such an *a*). With the final *o* of the manuscript *meoto* taken as a scribal dittographing of the earlier *o*, the reading *meota* would give an Anglian imperative of the verb *metian* 'to deliberate', and *sige* may be a separate word, so that *hreð* belongs to the genitive *secga*. The reading then would be 'Site nu to symle, ond on sæl meota / sige hreðsecga.' 'Sit now at the feast, and in due season attend to the victories of glorious warriors' would be a rough rendering of this far less bold reading. The point that in l. 1530 (not mentioned) the metre seems to point to the Anglian original form *Hyglaces*, as necessary, and similar occasions where the little knowledge we have of O.E. dialects may throw some light, would have been worth noticing.

Having emphasized this somewhat over-confident and over-brief tendency to textual emendation which runs through most of Mr. Andrew's book, one must add that it remains true that his main contentions are both just and important. Much of what he has to say had already been made fairly clear in his *Syntax and Style in Old English*: and perhaps this little book should either have been less ambitious or much larger. But on every page there is something challenging, stimulating, or informative. Mr. Andrew, in thus provocatively taking up the cause of neglected syntax once more after the distractions suffered by most scholars through the years of war, will be thought by most readers to have done right in not allowing further time to elapse before driving home his points—even if in so doing he has sometimes shown the just reformer's partiality and incompleteness. Nor is it to be denied that both editors and students of *Beowulf*, and of O.E. poetry generally, needed the challenge and the stirring-up which this book provides. Gratitude and humility should be the dominant feelings of his readers.

C. L. WRENN

A Commentary on the General Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*.

By MURIEL BOWDEN. Pp. xii+316. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. 20s. net. \$4.00.

This book is addressed to specialists in Chaucer, to college students, and to the general reader. For the first, Dr. Bowden has 'attempted to collect and arrange the outstanding latest critical opinions on the *General Prologue*'; for the second, she has 'expanded the more important notes to be found in good editions of the *Canterbury Tales* with the hopes that the late fourteenth century will take on the colours of actuality'; for the third, she has 'striven to make clear what is obscure in the language, or in the ideas, customs, and institutions of Chaucer's England'. After an introductory sketch of England in 1380-7, and a chapter on pilgrimages, Dr. Bowden proceeds to 'The Perfect Knight', 'The Young Squire and the Yeoman', 'The Prioress, her Chaplain, and her Priest', and so on to 'Our Host'. Much illuminating material from medieval Latin, Old French, and Middle English is presented in translation or glossed. In addition to documentation at the end of each chapter, there is a concluding bibliography of eighteen pages.

If a proposal to expand the editorial notes on Chaucer should happen to strike undergraduates as a menace, they may be assured that in the hands of Dr. Bowden the process becomes more like a weaving of magic carpets. The things she writes about constantly do 'take on the colours of actuality': Canterbury Cathedral as Chaucer knew it, the Man of Law doing business 'at the Parvys', the Manciple making purchases 'by taille', the 'ferne halwes' visited by the Wife of Bath, even Belmarye, Lyeys, Tramyssene, and the other remote crusading-grounds of the Knight. The attack on 'what is obscure' in the literal meaning of the General Prologue recalls the successful war-time operation known as *Fido*.

In the built-up areas of controversy Dr. Bowden is inclined to accelerate, sometimes giving a blurred impression of existing 'critical opinions' and passing at top speed the pointers to the inner meaning of the poem. The view that Baldeswelle, where the Reeve lived, 'lay partly in the manor of Foxley, which belonged to the Pembrokes' is repeated without reference to additional data on the subject in *T.L.S.* in 1932, and there is no reference to the interesting information about Henry Bailly of Southwark in the same weekly in 1928. Dr. Bowden approves 1387 as the date of composition of the General Prologue without pausing to mention Professor Carleton Brown's highly challenging article [*S.P.* xxxiv (1937), p. 8], or the possibility that Chaucer may have assigned the pilgrimage to a year considerably earlier than the writing of the poem. Since the setting-out of the pilgrims is the event he dates, and since April is associated with Easter, the following statement is disconcerting: 'In giving an April background to the *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer shows that he did not intend that his pilgrims should arrive at Canterbury at the time of one of the great festivals, which were held in December and July' (p. 34). It is good that the question of Chaucer's intention has been raised, but a pity that it has been so hastily dismissed.

The identifications of the pilgrims proposed by Professor Manly in *Some New Light on Chaucer* (1926) are steadily advocated in the *Commentary*, on occasion

without due testing. Is there, for instance, any evidence that John Bussy of Lincolnshire, M.P. in 1383, 1388, and thereafter, was old enough to be the white-bearded Franklin who had served in parliament 'ful ofte tyme'? That Bussy had served only once before 1387, the date here favoured for the General Prologue, is a difficulty lost sight of in the claim: 'he served in many parliaments in the reign of Richard II' (1377-99). A glance at the *Rolls* of the period reveals enough about William Brampton, governor of the staple at Middleburgh from 1384, to emphasize the insecurity of the case for Gilbert Maghfeld as the original of the Merchant—he who was 'so estatly . . . of his governaunce', so concerned for the safety of the Middleburgh-Orwell crossing, wore a Flemish beaver hat, &c. This is not to hold a brief for Brampton as the Merchant but to suggest that the plea for Maghfeld needs further examination. Professors Manly and Cook agree in regarding the portrait of the Knight as composite, but Manly thinks it represents the Scropes, Cook the Derbys. One argument is quoted without the other. Yet together they imply that Chaucer was thinking of several, if not all, of the Englishmen who took part in the crusades from about 1340 onwards. In portraying the 'son' of the Knight he was evidently thinking of the military feats of Englishmen in the secular sphere; for the Squire not only alludes in his Tale to the opening phase of the Hundred Years War but is said in the General Prologue to have served in Flanders, Artois, and Picardy, where that war began with the English chevachees of 1339-40. Dr. Bowden, following Professor Tatlock, associates the Squire's experience 'in chyvachie' with Bishop Despencer's campaign in the specified region in 1383. Chaucer may or may not have been referring to 1383; the point seems to be that no sound criterion for deciding this question, or others like it, is available in the present imperfect state of our knowledge of his intentions.

The *Commentary* may not prove entirely satisfactory at all points to specialists, but it is nevertheless a valuable and welcome piece of work, packed with interesting information admirably set forth.

MARGARET GALWAY

Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes. By ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS.

Pp. ix+503. New York: Columbia University Press, 1949. \$6.75.

Since the publication of *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*, Professor Loomis has enriched Arthurian scholarship with many original essays in which he has penetrated even more deeply into the tangle of Celtic traditions. These essays [cf. especially *J.E.G.P.* xlii (1943), 149-84, *Speculum*, xx (1945), 183-203, *P.M.L.A.* lvi (1941), 887-936] indicated that he was moving away from Jesse Weston's ritualist theories towards a more detailed assessment of the influence of Welsh tradition in particular on Arthurian romance. Now Professor Loomis altogether withdraws the thesis of the 'origin of the Grail in a Celtic caldron of plenty or in a fertility symbol' and concentrates on reaffirming the 'three major theses of the earlier book' that 'Celtic mythology is the principal root of Arthurian tradition', that 'this tradition, originating in Ireland, Wales and Cornwall, was passed on by professional story-tellers to the Bretons and through them to the French and Anglo-Normans', and that Arthurian personal names are for the

most part of Welsh derivation (p. ix). Professor Loomis would probably admit that his first two points, however indispensable, still require a great deal of confirmatory evidence. Celtic mythology, in the absence of early archaeological detail for such figures as Modron, Bran, or Beli (all of fundamental importance in Professor Loomis's opinion for later Arthurian romance) is often considered solely on the incomplete and confused basis of the Mabinogion and the Triads; nor does the vital place assigned to Breton *conteurs* by Professor Loomis rest on evidence as conclusive as one might desire.

Professor Loomis scrupulously investigates, incident by incident, Chrétien's Arthurian romances (*Erec, Le Chevalier de la Charrette, Yvain, Le Conte del Graal*) and relates these incidents wherever possible to Welsh or Irish originals, and to such parallel incidents in Arthurian romance as can be shown to reflect the original Celtic story more faithfully than Chrétien's version. Professor Loomis compels one's profound admiration because of his astonishing command of French, German, English, and Italian Arthurian romance and of Irish and Welsh saga. He proves again and again that the tradition which gave Chrétien de Troyes the *matière* of his poems consisted of a relatively restricted number of 'great tales' which, varied and embellished, distorted and misunderstood, intertwined and separated, gave to Arthurian romance its mazelike quality and its characteristic feeling of certain identical patterns, disappearing and re-emerging not unlike the pattern in an Oriental rug. Such 'great tales' are the story of Modron-Morrigan and her lovers, with its influence on the stories of Arthur, Lancelot, Sir Launfal, and other fairy-lovers; the saga of the *Sickbed of Cuchullinn* which appears in Arthurian Legend in stories of Besieged Ladies and Damsels in Distress [cf. the study of Professor H. Newstead, a pupil of Professor Loomis, in *P.M.L.A.* lxiii (1948), 803-30]; the story of the Annual Combat of Winter and Summer for the Earth Goddess, from which the tradition of the abduction of Guenevere derives; the story of the Hero fostered by women, a matrilinear tradition associated originally with such Irish figures as Lugh, Cuchullinn, and Finn, and through them with the *enfances* of Lancelot and Perceval; and the legends, analysed already in Professor Loomis's earlier book, connected with the Irish shape-shifter Curoi, which appear in Arthurian romance in such various guises as the Beheading Game and the motive of the Perilous Bed. Professor Loomis shows the same traditions at work in the case of the heroes and heroines of these stories: the literary descendants of such Welsh figures as Bran, Manawydan, Modron, &c., crop up with names truncated or confused, but with their essential activities and attributes still discernible in widely variant settings. One of Professor Loomis's most typical demonstrations is to show that Baudemaguz, the father of Meleagant (Guenevere's abductor), owes his name to a coalescence of the names of the two divine brothers of Welsh mythology, Bran and Manawydan (pp. 240-50).¹

While Professor Loomis is, on the whole, fair to earlier Arthurian scholars, he

¹ The case for a derivation of the -magus part from Manawydan via Mangon is debatable. A. C. L. Brown's argument that Mangon is an apocopated form of Amangon and that Amangon in turn goes back to the Irish Amargon seems on safer ground in view of the striking resemblances of the two characters. On the other hand, Professor Loomis is

seems to underestimate the late A. C. L. Brown's *Origin of the Grail Legend*. Brown's thesis of the struggle between the beneficent forces of Irish mythology, the matrilinear Tuatha Dé Danann (the precursors of the Grail-folk), and the red Fomorians (like many though not all Arthurian Red Knights enemies of the Grail), calls for detailed discussion rather than silence. In connexion with other arguments in his book Brown's interpretation of this struggle offered a first unifying principle for the study of the Matter of Britain, especially if it is realized that this struggle probably represents the supplanting of a matrilinear form of society by a hostile patrilinear group of invaders. On the other hand, Brown's (and W. A. Nitze's) derivation of the Grail from certain vessels of plenty of Celtic and especially Irish mythology, is strengthened by Professor Loomis's scholarly proof that the platter of the Welsh King Rhydderch must be considered as the only true Welsh prototype of the Grail, and that only through Rhydderch and his platter can we pass back to Bran who, in Professor Loomis's opinion, is the original of Chrétien's Maimed King. Here again one regrets that Professor Loomis does not deal with Brown's (and W. A. Nitze's) derivation of Chrétien's Maimed King from the British god Nodens (Nuadu-Nudd).

Professor Loomis's occasional impatience with scholars investigating Arthurian material from other than purely Celtic points of view leads to an underestimation of their work and method. The two essays, rather lightly dismissed on p. 466, are in fact of considerable importance, while a comparison of Professor Loomis's account of the traditional sources of Erec's and Enide's behaviour with A. Adler's excellent psychological study of the same subject [*P.M.L.A.* lx (1945), 917-46] shows the necessary limitations of an exclusively Celticist method.

To sum up, Professor Loomis's brilliant book compels admiration because of his profound knowledge of Celtic story and his incontrovertible demonstration of its influence on Chrétien de Troyes; on the other hand, one puts the work down realizing how much additional research will have to be undertaken to reconcile the often conflicting theories of different Celtic scholars, and to relate their views to the work of the more conservative literary critics of Arthurian romance.

JOHN E. HOUSMAN

Rollo Duke of Normandy or The Bloody Brother. By JOHN FLETCHER and others. Edited by J. D. JUMP. Pp. xxxiv + 107 (Liverpool English Texts and Studies). Liverpool: The University Press, 1948. 15s. net.

The seventeenth-century popularity of *Rollo* has not saved it from a condition approaching oblivion. Rymer chose it for his first instrument of aggression against the dramatists of the last age, thus making plain its continued appeal in

certainly right in emphasizing that the activities and the first part of the name of Baudemaguz resemble those of Bran and his Arthurian descendants. As a final corroboration it may be mentioned that in Ulrich Füeteler's unduly neglected German prose version of the Vulgate Lancelot, the tournament by the tents, which in the French Vulgate versions is presided over by Brangorre (= Bran the Giant), is held under the auspices of Baudemaguz, whose daughter, as in the French, falls in love with the victor, Bohort.

the Restoration playhouse, but unlike *The Maid's Tragedy* and *A King and No King*, on which also Rymer had much to say, *Rollo* is to-day rarely examined. Yet, apart from its contemporary popularity, it has the interest of exhibiting in an extreme form the Jacobean practice of collaboration. Fletcher's fellow-workers in this play were, beyond much doubt, Jonson, Chapman, and Massinger. To read it is to speculate somewhat vainly on how these dramatists worked out their distribution of labour. If we accept Mr. Jump's attributions, Acts I and II were respectively by Massinger and Fletcher, Act V was by Fletcher with an introductory section by Massinger, Acts III and IV were shared by Fletcher, Chapman, and Jonson. One would guess that the play began as a collaboration between Massinger and Fletcher, who were responsible for the general planning.

Mr. Jump has had to choose between two texts. The play was first printed in 1639, probably some fifteen years after its composition. In this quarto it is called *The Bloody Brother* and is said to be 'By B. J. F.' A second quarto, calling the play *The Tragedy of Rollo Duke of Normandy* and attributing it to Fletcher, appeared at Oxford the following year. Mr. Jump has come to the conclusion that the second quarto was printed from a prompt-book, the first from a manuscript of a more 'literary' type, and he has therefore based his text on Q2. The grounds for this choice seem satisfactory, despite certain touches in the Q1 list of dramatis personae which seem to bring us close to an author's hand: Latorch is there described as 'Rollo's Earewig', while he is only 'Favorite to Rollo' in Q2; Gisbert and Baldwin appear as 'the Chancellour' and 'the Princes Tutour' in Q1, which is here more precise than Q2 with its '*Two Counsellors of State*'. However, Mr. Jump has demonstrated that Q1 frequently smoothes and blunts the original text in places where Q2 preserves it.

If Q1 is an inferior text, it has a peculiar interest in the bibliographical puzzle which it presents. Its collation proceeds normally as far as G, when a single leaf g appears, followed by a second sheet marked G. Mr. Jump has noted that three different styles are used in the printing of scene-headings, and from this and other evidence he deduces that at least three compositors were employed. But he has apparently not noticed that there are two forms of the running-title: *The Bloody Brother* occurs in sheets B-E, [1st] G and g, and in the outer formes of sheets [2nd] G and H; *The bloody Brother* occurs in sheets F and I, and in the inner formes of sheets [2nd] G and H.¹ Mr. Jump has said that [1st] G and g cannot easily be assigned to any of his three compositors, but the evidence of the running-title together with the use in [1st] G of scene-headings in the same style as appears in B-D suggests that Mr. Jump's first compositor (X) worked here. It seems likely, moreover, that the compositor of F, completing III. i at the end of that sheet, mistakenly passed on to IV. ii: we may observe that the two examples of a wrong signature in the text (E3 for F3, C2 for G2) occur in sheets F and [2nd] G. The missing III. ii and IV. i would have been later inserted on [1st] G and g. It is difficult to understand why the two forms of the running-title occur respectively on the outer and inner formes of [2nd] G and H.

¹ On [2nd] G4^v the form used is *The Bloody Brother*. The details given are from the complete British Museum copy and the two Dyce and Forster copies: the imperfect British Museum copy (wanting 14 leaves) agrees as far as its evidence goes.

Mr. Jump has given a scholarly text and a full commentary in which he adduces many parallel passages from the dramatists to whom this play is assigned. It would perhaps also be worth noting that there is a faint echo of *Troilus and Cressida*, III. ii. 27-8, in *Rollo*, v. i. 12-14 (where the same military image is used of a love-encounter), and one of *Hamlet*, III. iii. 80-1, in *Rollo*, v. ii. 17-18 (where Edith plans to kill Rollo with 'all his lusts upon him').

CLIFFORD LEECH

The Court Wits of the Restoration. By JOHN HAROLD WILSON. Pp. x+264. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$4.00; 22s. net.

The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy. By JOHN HARRINGTON SMITH. Pp. xii+252. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$3.50; 20s. net.

'I have seriously considered one thing', Rochester wrote to his old friend Harry Savile, 'that of the three businesses of this age, Women, Politics, and drinking, the last is the only exercise at which you and I have not proved our selves errant fumblers. . . .' It is one of the merits of Professor J. H. Wilson's interesting and authoritative study of the Restoration Wits that those three topics are kept in their proper proportion. Professor Wilson, whose papers in various learned journals and whose edition of the *Rochester-Savile Letters, 1671-1680*, give evidence of his familiarity with Restoration life and letters, has the necessary judgement and good sense to produce a balanced account of the Wits and their doings, literary, political, and social. His decision to consider them as a group is fully justified, for their writings (and to some extent their behaviour) can only be fully comprehended if we remember that they were often their own first audience. Much of what they wrote, in fact, was meant primarily for the eyes of their friends; much of what they did was, fortunately, never made public. As Professor Wilson reminds us, too, the group-spirit sometimes extended to the joint composition of plays and other pieces. Seen as a group, they tend to appear a good deal more human; and if their drinking and wenching and occasional clashes with the Watch are sometimes as bad as Macaulay makes out, Professor Wilson is able to demonstrate successfully that their reputation has suffered a good deal from unfounded gossip. There was no Lord Mohun among them, no Earl of Pembroke. Their faults, too, are partly redeemed by their genuine friendships, their wit and intelligence, and sometimes by a surprising attention to business in later life. On the other hand, there were a number of slight, unmeritable men among them like Sir Car Scroope (of whom there is an excellent account here) who survive more by their contact with other and wittier men than by any merit of their own. What gives Professor Wilson's investigations some additional importance is the fact that his Wits were continually appearing, in one form or another, in the comedy of the period: they either put themselves into their own plays, or Shadwell and others did it for them.

It is possible to quarrel with some of Professor Wilson's individual judge-

ments. Mrs. Behn, for instance, can hardly be thrust in along with Ayloffe, Duke, Tate and others as a 'romantic poetaster'. Sir Samuel Tuke's *Adventures of Five Hours* is, no doubt, 'amazingly involved', but is it also 'amazingly dull'? True, it is not distinguished by much verbal grace or by many (other than strictly dramatic) ideas, but as a comedy of intrigue it is undeniably lively. The outstanding quality of this book, however, is its sanity. Professor Wilson has given the first full account of the Wits as a group, appearing neither for the prosecution nor the defence, but holding his own judicial inquiry into their lives, their writings, and their reputation. He has blown away a lot of cobwebs, and let in a lot of light and fresh air.

The 'gay couple', as Professor John Harrington Smith understands the term, are the young lady and young gentleman of Restoration comedy who 'disown the scandal of love, and call it gallantry, mirth, and raillery'. Love is an elaborate game to be played with finesse and high spirits, a duel between the sexes which usually ends (out of complaisance to the ladies in the boxes) in marriage. He traces the development of this couple from the 1660s to their decline and virtual extinction in the early eighteenth century. He notes an age of comparative innocence in the years immediately following the Restoration, and places the change to a much more cynical type of comedy about 1675-6, when for the next decade 'cuckolding and seduction are the dominant themes', and the heroes are often patterned after Horner and Dorimant. It is true enough that the Etherege of *Love in a Tub* is inspired by little worse than an engaging impudence, while in *The Man of Mode* his rakes are dangerously at large in a less innocent and more sinister world. It is true, too, that cuckolding, from being only hinted at in the 1660's, has by the second decade of the Restoration become almost the chief business of life. The main lines of Professor Smith's picture are no doubt fairly enough drawn. But, as he notes himself, the revised version of Dryden's *Kind Keeper* (1669) shows the same deepening of cynicism as he reserves for the period after 1675, and during that same period Shadwell and one or two others are out of step with their more cynical contemporaries. Any attempt, in fact, to fix dates of this kind too precisely is bound to leave some of the evidence out of account. In plotting the graph of contemporary taste, too, it is necessary to consider not only the new plays that were being produced every season, but the frequency with which the old ones were revived. The fact that such comedies as *The Country Wife* and *The London Cuckolds* were so revived during the reigns of William and Mary and of Anne does not actually falsify Professor Smith's picture of what was happening in the theatre (for there is clearly a distinction to be made between old smut revived and smut newly written), but it does suggest some modification of emphasis. By the 1690s a reaction was well under way: the giddy rake was going out of fashion with the ladies, and the man of sense was coming into favour. When, in the first years of the new century, the man of sense began to pass perceptibly into the man of sensibility, the gay couple were almost driven from the stage.

There is plenty of evidence in this book of Professor Smith's wide and close reading of the plays of his period, and his judgements are sometimes pleasantly independent. Occasionally, perhaps, he shows a slight absence of proportion;

e.g. Southerne's *The Wives Excuse* is certainly an interesting play and a thoroughly intelligent play, but can it fairly be called (p. 144) 'this great play'? Again, to say (p. 76) that no period ever took love more seriously or thought more seriously about marriage than that of the Restoration is to make a valid enough point at the cost of some exaggeration. *The Gay Couple*, however, is an interesting study, and makes a useful and independent contribution to a field which has been by no means neglected in recent years.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND

The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne. By ERNEST NEVIN DILWORTH. Pp. xiv+115. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$2.29; 12s. 6d. net.

Laurence Sterne's 'Sermons of Mr. Yorick'. By LANSING VAN DER HEYDEN HAMMOND. Pp. xii+198 (Yale Studies in English 108). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$3.00; 21s. net.

About a generation ago Edmund Gosse wrote of Sterne: 'No-one has ever flourished who has combined such alternating powers of attraction and repulsion.' During the years between this pronouncement and Mr. Dilworth's all-out defence of Sterne the jester, his subject's powers of repulsion have diminished and those of attraction have increased. Young readers to-day are apt to take to Sterne, easily and with delight, sailing over the obstacles that impeded the approach of an older generation. They find him a fresh and modern voice, and do not need an introduction. His quick changes and his fooleries do not tease them; they recognize the complexities of his temperament and enjoy his self-deflating wit. His calculated discontinuity is a natural language to those who twiddle the knobs of the wireless and watch on the screen the changing angles of the camera. It may even be that the provocations of his method have lost their glitter, since the visual arts have afforded so many analogies. On the other hand, his fluidity of movement, the grace of his acrobatic performance, are all the more admired. Sterne, in short, is more congenial to this generation than to their grandparents.

Mr. Dilworth, however, feels that we still regard him through dark glasses, not quite so densely smoked as those of the Victorians, but bad enough. We are not so deeply distressed by his morals, but we are almost equally worried by his sentimentality. Mr. Dilworth's witty, persuasive, and entertaining book is devoted to showing us that we need not be, that Sterne's sentimentality is all a joke, a parody and *reductio ad absurdum* of a prevailing mode—in fact, the lugubrious grimace of a jester who 'finds sentiment amusing for what can be done with it'. This conception he supports with missionary energy and an agile delicacy of comment. Critics and scholars, he says, are apt to bolt their literary meals; Mr. Dilworth discriminates exactly between the dishes. He is concerned with Sterne as he appears in *Tristram Shandy* and *A Sentimental Journey*—a shallow man, who 'made comic art of what is called a disability'. He dismisses the Yorkshire parsonage as a cage out of which Yorick escaped, and makes no play at all with the psychological and pathological approach. His business is

literary, the defining of attitude and the inspection of the means by which it is communicated.

Every other aspect of Sterne is subordinated to this attempt to clear up what Mr. Dilworth considers a gross misapprehension. But he is an honest reader and allows us to perceive, here and there, the existence of passages which he has found some difficulty in fitting into his formula. The reviewer thinks that he over-simplifies the humourist's material. We readily grant him Amandus and Amanda, Maria and the goat, and all the mockery of tears and heartstrings, and we will not contend for either ass, the living or the dead; but Mr. Dilworth himself allows Sterne an open mind and warm heart as well as an 'immoderately winking eye', and his lightning transitions are all the more acceptable to the Comic Muse if, when he cocks a snook at the pathetic scene he has just cunningly over-elaborated, his 'organic irreverence' involves his own emotion. Mr. Dilworth enjoys his laugh at Uncle Toby and the fly, but he omits the counter-movement that returns us to the placid, fraternal gaze that shames Walter's irascibility. There is a similar movement when the 'lashes' of Walter's farcical despair remind Trim of those he saw a grenadier receive at Bruges, and Walter blushes. Even the juxtaposition in Susanna's mind of the ideas of her mistress's grief and the green satin would have been less of a 'delicious mixture' if her sympathy with her mistress had been mere convention. Sterne loves to tread the edge of ridicule and tenderness, and expects to find the gentle courtesy, in which he delights, mixed up, in others and in his own appreciation, with amusing 'extraneous considerations'. He likes it best that way. But wholly to eliminate the ingredients of true feeling from his caprices impoverishes our humorous perception of them. It is not Mr. Dilworth's cue to write of Sterne's lyrical moments, such as his vision from his Paris window and his lament for the passing of our days, 'flying over our heads like light clouds on a windy day'; but is not his Uncle Toby rather *thin*? It is the little leaven of true 'respectability' that raises his ludicrous substance to full rotundity.

Dr. Hammond's book is a different sort of thing altogether. It is a thorough and scholarly investigation of Sterne's sermons, in the course of which he has read more than six thousand sermons and well over a hundred thousand pages of other relevant works. The hours spent on such an undertaking are justified if some vexed question is thereby set at rest or new light cast on the work of a major writer. Dr. Hammond undertook to examine Sterne's plagiarisms, and he has established, beyond doubt, by means of nearly a hundred pages of parallel passages, the large extent of these, while from his inquiry certain conclusions of definite interest have emerged. Sterne's borrowings are mostly from well-known writers and are in accordance with a common practice of the time. Those sermons in which the borrowed material is most copious, and the borrowing most literal, are found in the two posthumously published volumes, and Dr. Hammond believes that they belong to Sterne's early days as a parish priest and were never intended for publication. In the volumes which Sterne himself published the borrowings are comparatively slight and are the starting-points of individual developments. Dr. Hammond would date nearly all the sermons between 1737 and 1745, at least in rudimentary form. He thinks that none were

written deliberately for publication, and that, when Sterne was invited to preach after the appearance of *Tristram Shandy*, he had recourse to existing compositions. If his arguments are accepted, it is interesting to see how early Shandyism began to develop. There is little foreshadowing of it in the posthumous volumes, but much in the others—dialogue, character, digressions, the delight in alternately shocking and moving his audience, and a subtle, flexible, and economical style. It would follow, then, that at least fifteen years before Yorick flew out of what Mr. Dilworth calls his cage, he was trying over the notes of his peculiar song inside it. Some degree of revision before publication there must have been, but Sterne's style may well have owed as much to his pulpit practice as his matter to his reaction from it.

Dr. Hammond's arguments are methodical and well-supported and his conclusions judicious. He handles his material with prudence and does not seek to prove too much. For Sterne the preacher he puts in a modest claim. His sermons have no weight; Dr. Johnson, we know, compared them to the froth on the cup of salvation; but he genuinely sought to help his people by directing them to consider the motives of their daily conduct. This even a jester may do without hypocrisy.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

The Triumph of Form. A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet. By WALLACE CABLE BROWN. Pp. x+212. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1948; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. \$3.50; 20s. net.

This book is a study, in six critical essays, of those eighteenth-century poets, later than Pope, who used the heroic couplet with most distinction. The later masters thus 'revaluated' (as the author calls the process he applies to them) are Gay, Johnson, Churchill, Goldsmith, and Crabbe. Young and Cowper are housed together in one chapter because early in their careers, and against the inclination of their genius, they acknowledged the public prestige of the couplet by publishing second-rate satires in that form. A Prologue and Epilogue are added to clamp the essays together in a volume. The former briefly traces the earlier history of the heroic form of couplet and summarizes the best modern commendations of Dryden's and Pope's mastery of it. The Epilogue fades out on a note of dissolution, with the traditional couplet giving way in the early nineteenth century to the less successful run-on form which, it is contended, became merely 'blank verse with decorative rhymes in pairs'.

For his critical method the author adopts the techniques of the laboratory and appears to have tried them out in the classroom. There is a microscopic examination of the metre of specimen passages, hundreds of lines are counted and arithmetical conclusions arrived at, and many poems are skilfully sliced into their structural parts like those neat wooden models used in teaching solid geometry. There is, too, the insistent presence of the demonstrator himself with his reiterated 'Note, for example, . . .', his transparent conviction that we are a dull class who must sometimes have the obvious laboriously expounded to us,

and his keenness to stick a tidy technical label or critical commonplace on each specimen (e.g. 'syntactic balance and parallelism', 'non-imitative realistic description', 'dramatic tensions', 'organ music', &c.). Unwaveringly conscientious, he rejects nothing, except perhaps Dr. Johnson's advice that too much nicety of detail will disgust the greatest part of readers.

If these be considered objections, it must be answered that there is much to be said for the author's method and his endeavour to achieve an objective precision in criticism. No poetry invites it like that of the eighteenth century, none is less likely to be injured by it. Eighteenth-century poets were very willing to discuss the problems of their art and more use might have been made of their own remarks on technique.

The defect here lies in the operator rather than the instrument. Professor Brown is only applying more closely the methods which, as he reminds us, have been used with the greatest success by scholars like Tillotson, Root, and Leavis. If his application is less successful than theirs, it is because he lacks the imaginative insight of his exemplars and their ability to express their conclusions winningly and with an upward flight that depends not on mechanical instruments alone for its propulsion. Moreover, where precise methods are used we expect to find exactness in all things. Here it is not always so. Apart from misprints in both text and quotations, sometimes affecting the metre, diphthongs are often called long vowels, and the scansion is not always acceptable. For instance, failure to remember that in the seventeenth century the accent fell on the first syllable of 'July' makes nonsense of his observations on the metre of Waller's line, 'Tempests hot July with December's frost'.

And here a larger consideration must be intruded. If the results of this study leave us less than satisfied it is partly because the author is being too faithful to conventional methods. He rightly works on the assumption that poetry is largely a matter of the metrical arrangement of sounds. Can we hope then to achieve any adequate examination of their functioning until we push out beyond the accepted methods and employ a more numerous set of symbols for indicating the varying degrees of stress, along with phonetic transcripts, historically adjusted, and graphical representations of the movements of intonation and rhythm in verse?

Even without these aids, those who are willing to read slowly, and often laboriously, and to set their own analyses against the author's, will get from the book an increased awareness of the richly complex technique of eighteenth-century verse. There is need of a good book analysing the technical developments of that verse. This unfortunately, but decidedly, is not it. Nevertheless there is much in it that one can recommend. The protean irony of Churchill's manner is caught in the author's fine net and held before us in all its living malice. The structure of *The Deserted Village* and the 'dramatic tensions' of *London* and *The Vanity of Human Wishes* are convincingly exposed. Best of all, and thoroughly readable, is the essay where, elaborating the suggestions of Leavis, the author offers an absorbing exposition of the art of Crabbe, whose skill in the short narrative poem has scarcely been surpassed by later writers of the short story in prose.

COLIN J. HORNE

Ten English Farces. Edited by LEO HUGHES and A. H. SCOUTEN. Pp. xvi+286. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1948. No price given.

It is not clear what purpose this collection is intended to serve. The editors' object has been 'to make accessible a representative group of Restoration and eighteenth-century farces', but, as they have excluded plays (i) 'to be found in modern editions', (ii) on 'the borderline between farce and comedy' (like those of Foote and Arthur Murphy), and (iii) of more than three acts (such as the eminently farcical Gay-Pope-Arbutnot *Three Hours after Marriage*, which has not been reprinted since 1807), the representativeness that they have achieved is at an extremely low, almost sub-literary level. The ten farces are Nahum Tate's *A Duke and no Duke*, Aphra Behn's *The Emperor of the Moon*, Ravenscroft's *The Anatomist*, Doggett's *Hob*, Charles Johnson's *The Cocker of Preston*, the one-act version of *The Devil to Pay* by Coffey and Mottley, the anonymous *The Bilker Bilk'd*, Thomas Sheridan's *The Brave Irishman*, Mrs. Inchbald's *Appearance is against Them*, and Prince Hoare's *No Song No Supper*. It is admitted in a Preface that there is 'no great literary merit' in any of these plays, but their one-time popularity is said to confer 'significance' upon them. Apparently the fact that Isaac Reed 'saw nearly twice as many performances of *The Devil to Pay* as he did of *Lear* or *The Way of the World* or *The Careless Husband*', though it 'tells us nothing about the respective merits of the plays', does 'tell us something of Reed and his generation'. There seems to be some muddled thinking here. Surely all that the Reed statistics tell us is that Isaac, having paid for his seat, liked to get his money's-worth by seeing the afterpiece as well as the play. He did not go to the theatre in order to see *The Devil to Pay*. And the fact that Reed's generation demanded an afterpiece with a 'stock' play—but not apparently with a new play or a special revival—is not really very 'significant' either. The surprising thing is how little custard-pie crudity the London theatre-goer was prepared to subsist on in the eighteenth century. The contrast with his nineteenth- and twentieth-century successors is very much to his credit.

Within its perverse limits this is a scholarly piece of work. Though rather badly written the introductions to the separate farces are packed with out-of-the-way information, and the *minutiae* of theatrical history that they record are especially valuable. But for a really representative collection of Restoration and eighteenth-century farce the student will be well advised to turn to the forty-six operas and farces that make up the last volume of *The British Drama* (1804). (Its printer was James Ballantyne—and the anonymous editor is almost certainly Sir Walter Scott.)

F. W. BATESON

Jane Austen. Facts and Problems. By R. W. CHAPMAN. Pp. viii+224. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. 10s. 6d. net.

Dr. Chapman tells us that, though he has spent a substantial slice of his life in the company of Jane Austen, her family, her friends, and her fiction, he has no impulse to attempt her life, or any systematic criticism of her art. His

appointment as Clark Lecturer, however, has moved him to complete 'a kind of survey' that he has had in mind and in preparation for many years, and we can now add this small, full book to the shelf of volumes for which we are so deeply in his debt—the editions of the novels, the minor works, the letters, and the *Memoir*. *Jane Austen: Facts and Problems* will be indispensable to scholars and a pleasure to that large body who, such is the peculiarity of her charm, settle down with pleased anticipation to consider which side of the front door the dining-room at Steventon parsonage lay, and to sort out the complicated facts that follow the statement: 'Five of the sons married nine wives and had issue.'

The book is dense with facts, genealogical, biographical, bibliographical, and chronological, in lucid order. Here we are told exactly what is known about Jane Austen, and how it comes to be known, and where knowledge gives way to supposition and probability. There is nothing rigid about Dr. Chapman's lucidity; he permits himself to suppose and imagine, as one thoroughly at home in his subject must do, but he never forces a point. Pleasing speculations and wise comments are dropped into the interstices of the facts, and harmonize strictly with them, and there is a supplement of notes on the novels in which he garners scattered observations and opinions.

Where there is so much of interest so closely packed, a reviewer can select only a few samples. Dr. Chapman defends the letters on two counts. He stresses their documentary interest. 'The social historian has at his command no equal picture of the life of the upper middle class in England in George the Third's last years.' This aspect is developed by the addition of much material concerning the Austen family, their relations and friends. Their value for the lover of the novels is indicated in the remark: 'She spent upon it (*sc.* the family) the same talents, and the same affection, as she gave to the creatures of her fancy.' The same talents; that is well said; and Dr. Chapman wins the same ready assent when he turns the matter round, and suggests that there is something aunt-like in her attitude to the young people of her fiction. It is specially perceptible in the way she regards Catherine Morland, and convinces one that *Northanger Abbey* underwent a good deal of revision. Dr. Chapman writes sensibly on the vexed question of Jane Austen's comment on Mrs. Hall's delivery of a dead child (Oct. 1798). A woman must wonder what all the vexation is about. It is not unusual for clever and sturdy young women to show a streak of rough jocosity in their remarks on marriage and childbearing, and certainly no argument of inhumanity. Delicacy is a growth of mature years. Dr. Chapman records in a note that he put the case to an audience of young women and had it received with a shout of merriment. Surely the matter can rest there. They could not all have been 'harpies'. As for Mrs. Jennings's mention of a natural child, which he says was expunged from the second edition of *Sense and Sensibility* (but surely, on Dr. Chapman's own showing in his edition, p. 384, it was not the mention that was expunged but the reaction of Lady Middleton's delicacy to it) it is not, I think, clear that convention forbade the recognition of such facts in a 'novel by a lady' as early as 1813. There are two such children in Colonel Brandon's narrative to Elinor, in the same book, and more significantly,

Harriet Smith's situation as a natural daughter is made to appeal to Emma's romantic imagination. The deletion may mean that Jane Austen, aware of the growing refinement of her day, yet felt that she had overdone it in the case of Lady Middleton.

Elsewhere in the book, Dr. Chapman disentangles the faint but not quite unsubstantial traces of Jane Austen's love affairs, gives the evidence for her revision of the early novels and an account of her dealings with her publishers, lists the existing portraits of her and adds a reproduction of what is possibly a new one. It would be a pleasure to discuss some of his critical opinions. They have no startling novelty on the main matters, and could not have, without losing touch with justice and moderation; but they are never stale, not only because they include fresh details and slants of inspection, but because they are kept warm by a generous and humane interest. It is to Jane Austen's power of creating and maintaining such a state in her readers that he points the critics who depreciate her. 'Mere accuracy and artistry cannot yield such interest', he writes. Not, at any rate, one that, after one hundred and thirty years and in a changed world, is still so widely operative.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

Wordsworth's View of Nature and its Ethical Consequences. By NORMAN LACEY. Pp. viii+128. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. 8s. 6d. net.

'We get several kinds of pleasure reading Wordsworth, but, as it seems to me, very little specifically *poetic* pleasure', says Mr. Lacey (p. 122). Most recent critics of Wordsworth seem almost to be of the same opinion, inasmuch as they have had much more to say about his life or his thought than about his poetry. The result has been, in writers like Mr. Herbert Read, or Mr. H. I'A. Fausset, a good deal of grave finger-wagging at the poet for not being a man other than he was, with views other than those he held. Mr. Lacey, who makes grateful acknowledgement to these two critics, follows their method while writing specifically as a Christian. 'He is finally concerned', as the dust-jacket says, 'more with what might have been the religious outcome of Wordsworth's mysticism than with a judgement on the poet.' Wordsworth, he claims, did not sufficiently prize the mystical experiences he had had (p. 117); that is, he did not try to 'understand' them (p. 118) and to live in the light of that understanding. This is an odd charge to make, for its terms seem to summarize what was in fact Wordsworth's whole effort. Certainly, he showed a 'lack of curiosity concerning his mystical experiences' (p. 118), but he was a poet, not a philosopher. He is important because 'understanding' for him was a matter, not of 'curiosity', but of imaginative re-creation, in order to grasp, not the implication of the experiences for a theology, but their quality as being. That Wordsworth did not as early as 1798 attempt precise explanation of his mystical experiences may be unfortunate, but can we regret this if he none the less managed to write great poetry? There is surely no guarantee that such explanation would in any fuller sense 'have led to the splendid life of the imagination which he had once seen in prospect' (p. 66). Whether it 'might have opened the way for him to a real

understanding of Christianity' (p. 65), we cannot say unless Mr. Lacey tells us how he believes Wordsworth's understanding of Christianity to have been unreal.

By refusing to formulate at once the precise theological implications of his mystical experiences, Wordsworth, says Mr. Lacey, was refusing his destiny. Instead, he merely looked backward: he placed his reliance on Nature and the language of the sense as he had known them in the unquestioning wholeness of his childhood and youth, rather than on the divine spirit in Nature, which, seen in Christian terms, might have supported him even in age. Again Wordsworth seems to have done just what Mr. Lacey says he did not, though his recognition of the transcendence as well as of the immanence of God was not immediate. Mr. Lacey seems to give far too much importance to the lines in 'Tintern Abbey' about Nature and the language of the sense. Persistently in *The Prelude*, Wordsworth emphasizes that it is in the activity of the mind in the presence of Nature, in the dominion she exercises over Nature, outward sense the obedient servant of her will, in the visitings of awful promise when the light of sense goes out, that greatness makes abode. He may have been wrong, from Mr. Lacey's point of view, to emphasize 'the human and not the Godward side of the experience' (p. 29), but if it is important to find faith in some sort of divine revelation, it is surely just as important to find faith in man's ability to receive it, particularly if your faith in man has been shaken. The error, if it was one, was inseparable from the effort to regain such faith; without the effort there may well have been no great poetry at all.

It is not difficult to find defects in the kind of stability which Wordsworth reached. In so far as admiration for Dorothy entered into it, Wordsworth may have under-estimated certain elements of inherited discipline in her apparently spontaneous nature (pp. 56 ff.). But she was in an obvious sense 'Nature's inmate': she led him back to the Nature which, for good or ill, was instrumental in his spiritual recovery. That he accepted her 'without serious thought' may have been the best thing for him, though it is far from certain that he did so, and Mr. Lacey brings no evidence in support of his own bare statement. In so far as Wordsworth's stability involved faith that others might be similarly regenerated, it implied, no doubt, an over-optimistic view of human nature, both in the inherent will to good, granted favouring circumstance, and in the prevalence of sensibility similar to his own. Finally, an uncritical admiration of the dalesmen was involved, an admiration prompted by Wordsworth's needs rather than his observation: they were thought of as living merely in harmony with Nature, and not at the same time in some degree of conflict with her; their life seemed to point to an unadventurous ideal of quiet frugality.

These are all defects worth pointing out, if not for the first time. But with them all, Wordsworth did write great poetry. It was not the poetry he at first thought himself capable of writing, but his achievement need not be judged by the hopes which Coleridge's early admiration induced. And any judgement of Wordsworth the man must do more than Mr. Lacey has done, and face the well-documented defence of Miss Batho.

E. A. HORSMAN

The Cowden Clarkes. By RICHARD D. ALTICK. Pp. xiv+268. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1948. 18s. net.

Mr. Altick has written a conscientious, useful, and mildly entertaining study of Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke. Their writings are so embarrassingly copious, and their style (especially Mary's) so more than embarrassingly flowery, as a rule, that we may be grateful for a manageable and on the whole well-proportioned survey of their long careers, which covered the greater part of the nineteenth century. Charles is, of course, well remembered as the son of Keats's school-master at Enfield, and as having, as Mr. Altick puts it, 'guided the poet expertly up Parnassus' by introducing him to the poetry of Spenser and George Chapman; Mary, rather more faintly, as the heroine of the first serious attempt at a concordance to the plays of Shakespeare. Both husband and wife were devoted disciples of Leigh Hunt, and did not, like Keats, grow away from him. Both were also well-liked, if not very prominent, members of the wide circle of friends gathered round Charles Lamb in his later years.

These facts are duly chronicled by Mr. Altick. Yet somewhat unexpectedly the 'pre-Victorian' part of his book does not prove to be the most interesting; for much of the matter is familiar, and no new material of consequence has been discovered. Here and there in the earlier chapters, too, Mary and her husband are almost completely overshadowed by the vigorous and versatile Novello family. There were ten children besides Mary, among them Alfred, founder of the music-publishing firm, and Clara, the famous soprano; and the parents, Vincent the musician, and Mary Sabilla the 'Wilful Woman', as Hunt called her, were both forceful and interesting characters. Hardly, in fact, before the accession of Queen Victoria do Charles and Mary begin to emerge as distinct personalities; Charles blossoming forth as a successful popular lecturer on literature, and Mary with her concordance (it took fifteen years to compile, and the manuscript filled a large travelling trunk) starting on her long career as critic, versifier, and miscellaneous writer. From Chapter VI onwards Mr. Altick gives us an interesting and often amusing picture of the Victorian literary scene, or rather of what might be termed 'the lower-middle-brow' section of it, in which the popularizing work of the Cowden Clarkes was far more prominent than the criticism of a real thinker like Matthew Arnold.

The book is more successful, I think, in making the hero and heroine come alive—Charles with his wig and his gift for making friends at almost every Mechanics' Institute in the country, Mary with her odd mixture of daily cold shower-baths and stuffy, respectable sentimentality—than in estimating how much good and how much harm they did in their chosen career as popular educators. Mr. Altick scarcely ventures on anything like a precise estimate, and rather shirks the final summing-up which seems called for. He is under no illusions regarding the survival-value of their work; the concordance is superseded, the lectures forgotten, the novels and verses quite worthless. Much of their criticism scarcely deserves the name at all, and shows a startling descent, or rather tumble, from the level of Coleridge and Hazlitt to something very near imbecility. Yet to treat them merely as figures of fun, as Mr. Altick sometimes seems inclined to do, would I think be a mistake. He might, for instance, in discussing *The Shake-*

Shakespeare-Key, have given them more credit than he does for their defence of Shakespeare's so-called anachronisms and their development of the idea of a double time-standard in many of the plays. The new lower middle-class reading public had to be given some guidance within its range of comprehension, and the Cowden Clarkes at any rate did something to convince a number of people that Shakespeare was better worth reading than Eliza Cook and Martin Tupper. When we consider the hordes of wholly uncritical readers (and listeners) which had sprung into existence by the eighteen-sixties, and the consequent temptations to mere charlatanism, our final judgement of the Cowden Clarkes is likely to contain about as much admiration of their honesty and industry as amusement and contempt at their all too frequent silliness and unconscious insincerity.

A few points of detail may be touched on in conclusion. It seems to me that a clearer account might have been given of Keats's early relations with Charles Cowden Clarke, and of his first meeting with Leigh Hunt, if more use had been made of Dr. Garrod's brilliant analysis of the available evidence [in *The Poetical Works of Keats* (Oxford, 1939), pp. lxxii-lxxix], particularly his suggestion that Keats may have returned to Edmonton for three months in 1816 to complete the required five years of apprenticeship to Hammond. Mr. Altick expresses surprise at Clarke's failure to introduce Keats to Hunt before October 1816; but the surprise would be lessened if we could assume, as I think Dr. Garrod shows we can, that Keats was at Edmonton, not in London, for at least three months early in 1816; for it has long been clear that the period from about May to October was fully occupied, first by medical work and then by a stay of some length at Margate.

In examining Clarke's lectures on the English comic writers (Chapter VII) Mr. Altick hardly shows the full extent of Clarke's indebtedness to Hazlitt, whose *English Poets and Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* were, I feel sure, drawn on as well as his *English Comic Writers*. The treatment, in the same chapter, of Clarke's share in the composition of the famous classic of cricket, Nyren's *Young Cricketers' Tutor*, is excellent; no one will now have any excuse for denying to Clarke his due share of the credit. But we cannot feel equally satisfied with the account, in Chapter X, of *The Song of Drop o' Wather*, the anonymous burlesque of *Hiawatha* attributed to Mary Clarke. The specimens quoted are not only very much above her other verses in technical competence but also very much (and very refreshingly) below them in 'propriety'. The British Museum Catalogue and Halket and Laing both support Mr. Altick; nevertheless the attribution seems so improbable that it is to be regretted that he did not set out the evidence in some detail.

R. W. KING

The Life of Edward FitzGerald, Translator of The Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám. By ALFRED MCKINLEY TERHUNE. Pp. xiv+374. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. 21s. net.

In his Foreword, Mr. Terhune speaks of the present work and also of a work in progress:

A wealth of manuscript material was made available to me. In my possession are copies of more than a thousand unpublished letters and portions of letters

which I am now editing for a complete edition of FitzGerald's correspondence. Books from the poet's library, his commonplace and notebooks, diaries of friends, and numerous other manuscripts have been placed at my disposal. Only a small portion of this material was available to Thomas Wright, the only previous author to attempt a complete account of FitzGerald's life.

We are ungrateful, therefore, when we find ourselves looking beyond the present biography to the promised edition of the letters—the publication of the complete correspondence of one of the most completely distinguished smaller writers of the last century will be a great event. Mr. Terhune does not give us the thousand new letters in this biography: he selects from them. Obviously, for a biographer, that was the only course. But, not quite so inevitably, such new letters as he does use he uses only in part, removing some of FitzGerald's sentences and marking the omissions with dots. I wonder if he can have any idea of the disappointments those dots cause his reader. I would draw his attention to such a typical transcription as the following: 'What do I mean by calling Browning *Cockney*?', said FitzGerald to Tennyson:

Well; you know it's not easy to define; but I believe that by *Cockney* I mean the affected and over-strained style which men born and bred in a City like London are apt to use when they write upon subjects with which neither their Birth nor Breeding (both rather plebeian) has made them familiar. So Leigh Hunt's were the *Cockney Pastoral*: Bailey's *Festus* (beg pardon!) *Cockney Sublime*: and I think Browning's Books *Cockney Profound* and *Metaphysical*. There is nearly always a smack of the *Theatre* in these writers. . . . Now a Tale I have read called 'Maud'—deals with a Browning sort of subject in a very different way: and I venture to think that it will be found when B. is nowhere. I think you know I don't flatter you, Alfred; and I know you wouldn't care for it if I did. . . . But you, A. T., tell me he is grand; and I ought to hold my tongue; only I remember you wanted to cram *Festus the Sublime* down our throats—you magnanimous great Dog you! [p. 320].

Here is an argument, and for a student of nineteenth-century poetry an important one. In its curtailed form, it makes a sense which may be the original sense in a general way. But, at the best, it is a less voluminous sense than that which FitzGerald passed on to Tennyson. We cannot, therefore, feel secure in using what we possess only in part. The sooner Mr. Terhune publishes his projected edition of the complete correspondence the better.

In that same Foreword, Mr. Terhune reminds us that

Aldis Wright, editor of FitzGerald's works, maintained that the correspondence which he published in the *Literary Remains* provided a satisfactory narrative of the poet's life; and he discouraged attempts to write a formal biography. Mr. Wright's selection of letters is an artistic achievement of unquestioned merit and discloses exceptional editorial acumen. However, ferreting out the story of a man's life from his correspondence is like reading a closely written manuscript by the light of a flickering candle. Only by intense application can so fragmentary a record of thoughts and occupations be pieced together into a coherent pattern. Despite one's pains it is impossible to find in letters all the items necessary to complete the design.

Mr. Terhune has an easy task in showing that Aldis Wright was wrong: for

instance, how can we possibly come to know the circumstances of FitzGerald's marriage from the letters—that silly fatal piece of unworldly generosity? And yet Aldis Wright was in a sense right. FitzGerald's life is a dull thing when compared with his writings, of which his letters are a part. Of course it is necessary to have the reliable biography Mr. Terhune has given us. But only for the sake of the specialists: for the literary historian and, to a less degree, for the literary critic. By these specialists Mr. Terhune's biography will be welcomed heartily. Several of the great Victorian writers tried to keep off future writers from the biographical materials which, like all other men, they could not help providing. Beyond a certain point at least, biographies seemed to them indecent. But their unavailing prohibition may well have been partly made in the interests of literature, in the interests of preventing the multiplication of books in the category of the dull. The biographies that are most worth reading are seldom those of authors. Mr. Terhune's book is not dull. It is, however, lacking in sparkle, except when FitzGerald or some other dead writer is quoted. This lack is partly the fault of Mr. Terhune: he sometimes writes heavily—as, for instance, here:

[The *Poems* of 1842] firmly established Tennyson's reputation as the foremost poet in England and laid the foundations of a popularity which eventually developed into idolatry;

or in the subtitle to the book; did Mr. Terhune fear we should think he was writing the biography of the Edward Marlborough Fitzgerald who appears on p. 354, 'a writer of occasional verse, with whom Edward FitzGerald had no wish to be identified, and who caused him to avoid using his own surname', or with the Edward FitzGerald who appears on p. 321, the superintendent of the county police, to whom Tennyson was directed when, suddenly landing in Woodbridge, he inquired for his friend? At other times Mr. Terhune shows himself capable of writing more pleasingly, but it may be hazarded that his gifts of piety and thoroughness will show themselves to best advantage in the promised edition of the letters. There can be no fear that he will not appreciate the honour that has befallen him.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

W. B. Yeats: Man and Poet. By A. NORMAN JEFFARES. Pp. viii+365. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1949. 21s. net.

This is an indispensable book, for, having been allowed access to unpublished diaries and letters and having conversed at length with Mrs. Yeats, Madame Maud Gonne MacBride, and others, Dr. Jeffares is in a position to offer much new and important information. At first, perhaps, one might be tempted to complain that, after the appearance of Joseph Hone's substantial volume in 1942, there was no immediate need for another full-length biography, and that Dr. Jeffares might have done better had he contented himself with showing in what important respects our general picture of Yeats as a man required to be modified or corrected in the light of new information, and had he then devoted himself to the discussion and illumination of particular aspects of his subject: such, for

example, as Love and Politics, The Search for a Philosophy, The Romantic Realist, External Nature, Methods of Composition. This complaint, though, would be ill judged. Except, perhaps, that of Rilke, there is scarcely any other example of a great poet having so consistently willed and made himself into the kind of poet he wanted to be—of a poet whom we can so clearly see (or think we see) being made into a poet by himself and by the circumstances of his life. Not only does a study of the life of such a poet help us to understand his poetry better—is, indeed, indispensable for a complete understanding of his poetry; it also helps us to understand better something of even greater importance, life itself, poetry itself, and the infinite possibilities of what Rilke called 'transformation'. It may well be that for some time to come studies of particular aspects of Yeats's achievement will continually require to be supplemented by new attempts to view his life and his achievement as a whole. We should, therefore, be grateful to Dr. Jeffares for having made one of these necessary attempts, and we may confidently expect from him more particular and detailed studies which this attempt will have greatly deepened and enriched.

Of the new information which Dr. Jeffares provides, the most sensational (the most important only in so far as it enables us to correct previous misstatements and to refute theories founded upon them) is that about Yeats's sexual life. It has often been stated that Yeats had had no sexual experience until his marriage at the age of fifty-two, and some critics have even professed to discover in this prolonged virginity an explanation of certain characteristics of his poetry; it is now, though, for the first time made public that, tortured by his unrequited love for Maud Gonne, Yeats, at the age of thirty, began a liaison, which lasted for a year, with an unhappily married lady whom the poet in his unpublished autobiography and Dr. Jeffares in his book decently, if a little transparently, veil under the name of 'Diana Vernon'; also that about 1910 he began another liaison, this time with an unmarried woman, which lasted some years.

But perhaps the most valuable thing about Dr. Jeffares's book is that it enables us to perceive again yet more clearly how Yeats was somehow able (or enabled) to transform his very limitations, deficiencies, and disappointments into conditions of fruitful activity. It is, for example, easy to laugh at his dabbings in the occult and in mysticism and at the gimcrack system of belief which he formulated in *A Vision*; nevertheless, as Mr. Frank O'Connor recently remarked in a broadcast, Yeats was an example of the fact that the most half-baked theory may be of more value to a poet than whole libraries of factual knowledge. He needed a religion and a philosophy, if only in order that he might be able to defend with reasons what, if he was to be and remain a poet, it was necessary for him to believe on instinct, but they had to be ones which he had largely made himself and which he could *picture*. No doubt what he evolved was a fantastic and gimcrack affair, but it gave him the support and confidence he needed, and moreover, as Dr. Jeffares remarks, it sharpened the dualism of his character, 'its dramatic alternations of quick enthusiasm for, and subsequent, almost immediate mockery of, some fantasy' (pp. 53-4). His love for Maud Gonne was not only unhappy but full of misunderstanding and self-deception; nevertheless, not only did the unhappiness inspire some of his best poetry, the very misunderstanding precipi-

tated him into all manner of activities which proved most fruitful to him both as a man and as a poet. He believed, mistakenly, that Maud Gonne could be made happier and better if only she could be taken away from the kind of life she was living and the kind of things she was doing into some other sphere, and he regarded it as his mission to 'save' her. At first he offered marriage as a refuge and protection; then, as his unpublished autobiography reveals, his part in the founding of the Irish literary movement was undertaken very largely in the conviction that 'he must set Maud Gonne to some new work'. In 1896 he went with Arthur Symonds to Paris with the object of founding an order of Celtic mysteries: 'Maud Gonne entirely shared this idea, and I did not doubt that in carrying it out I should win her for myself.' In January 1909 he wrote in his diary:

To-day the thought came to me that P.I.A.L. (Maude Gonne) never really understands my plans or notions or ideas. Then came the thought—what matter?—how much of the best that I have done and still do is but the attempt to explain myself to her? If she understood I should lack a reason for writing and one can never have too many reasons for doing what is so laborious (p. 141).

That is the fascination of Yeats's biography—to observe life continually supplying him with 'reasons for writing'.
J. B. LEISHMAN

The Great Tradition. By F. R. LEAVIS. Pp. vi+266. London: Chatto & Windus, 1948. 12s. 6d. net.

Forms of Modern Fiction. Essays collected in honor of Joseph Warren Beach. Edited by WILLIAM VAN O'CONNOR. Pp. ii+305. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1949. 25s. net.

'The great English novelists', says Mr. Leavis, 'are Jane Austen, George Eliot, Henry James and Joseph Conrad.' These, together with D. H. Lawrence, constitute his 'great tradition', and they 'are all distinguished by a vital capacity for experience, a reverent openness before life, and a marked moral intensity'. It should be said at the outset that the word 'tradition' is not used very clearly by Mr. Leavis. His conception of the major English tradition in the novel goes deeper than mere talk of indebtedness, 'influences', and so on, nor is he concerned only to exhibit common qualities in the novelists he admires; but there is a tendency to pleonasm in the various descriptions of 'tradition' (and of 'greatness') which he offers in the course of his argument, and the vagueness of the underlying critical concepts seems partly responsible for the uneven texture of the writing. Obscurities, uneasy qualifications, and qualifications of qualifications occur from time to time and deflect attention from what Mr. Leavis means to convey to the apparent difficulty he finds in conveying it. And it is a pity that this distinguished critical work, impressive in its general scope and often profoundly interesting in its particular analyses and judgements, should be so poorly constructed. This fault is perhaps more obvious in the first chapter than anywhere else; significantly, it is here that Mr. Leavis is drawing up his new map of the history of our fiction and explaining the lines on which the studies of

George Eliot, James, and Conrad, which compose most of the book, will be pursued. But these defects cannot preclude acceptance of a great deal that Mr. Leavis says and a respectful recognition of the sincerity and intelligence of his approach.

Mr. Leavis's literary criticism at its best (and it is often at its best in this book, especially in the second and fourth chapters) is 'pure' and hence difficult to summarize. Briefly, his thesis is that previous criticism of the novel has too much tended to discuss abstractions (characters, plot, content, &c.) without assessing, at a 'mature valuation', the nature and quality of a novel's total statement. And this valuation will usually involve moral and quasi-moral judgements. Mr. Leavis nowhere goes into the question of whether these judgements are of the same logical type as those made in purely 'technical' criticism, or how they are derived from the latter if they are not. I think it would be a fair and sufficient account of Mr. Leavis's general position to say that he requires the great novelist to be a serious writer dealing with serious subjects; the reader is assumed capable of recognizing for himself the criteria of seriousness. These criteria Fielding, for instance, is found not to satisfy: indeed, Mr. Leavis regards the English eighteenth-century novelists as important mainly (perhaps only) because they 'lead to' Jane Austen. Jane Austen, however, is not dealt with in detail. The aside on *Emma* (p. 10, n. 1) shows how valuable such a discussion might have been; and it would have been interesting also to see how Mr. Leavis would have correlated his account of her work with this subsequent pronouncement:

But George Eliot's is no satiric art; the perceptions that make the satirist are there right enough, but she sees too much, and has too much the humility of the supremely intelligent whose intelligence involves self-knowledge, to be more than incidentally ironical (pp. 69-70).

To make this correlation he would probably have had to make further distinctions in respect of Jane Austen's work. But the comment, in so far as it touches George Eliot, is excellent, and typical; Mr. Leavis emphasizes, like others before him, the nobility of George Eliot, but he is prepared to go further and show just what, in terms of artistic achievement and *ordonnance*, that quality, not simple in her, can give to and (regrettably) take from her work. Thus he is able to point out the inadequacy, in part, of Henry James's estimate of George Eliot, and demonstrate how, on a larger scale and in a more important context, the same sort of limitation both damages and restricts James's own treatment, in *The Portrait of a Lady*, of a theme cognate with that of 'Gwendolen Harleth'. But Mr. Leavis also brings out very clearly his point that George Eliot's well-known artistic inequality must not be simply accounted for by assuming the artist in her vanquished by the 'intellectual'; this could be said, without irrelevance, of the wasted labour in *Romola* and *Felix Holt*, but it is a distressingly facile emotional flow, not an aridity, which is more deeply deleterious to her art. Mr. Leavis shows how this brings about the slackening in her judgement of Dorothea as well as her more obvious and notorious succumbing to temptation in *The Mill on the Floss*. Her intellectual strength, on the contrary, is what often provides the necessary control and detachment. In comparing the 'bad part' of *Daniel Deronda* to

The Plumed Serpent Mr. Leavis makes this clear, but he never touches upon the dangers, much greater than any George Eliot ever encounters, inherent in Lawrence's presentational methods in his later novels. George Eliot gives us no Don Ramons. And a parallel investigation of strength and weakness in Lawrence (who disapproved somewhat of Jane Austen) might have produced interesting results.

Mr. Leavis's chapter on Henry James is not wholly satisfying. Whereas his emphasis on the immaturities in George Eliot's early novels, though rather exaggerated, can be justified by his special purpose, his analogous treatment of the early James throws his study of the novelist as a whole rather out of focus. James's range and variety, even in the earlier work, are not fully brought out in this section of the essay, probably because it is too telescoped. Again, Mr. Leavis's anxiety to fulfil a special purpose leads him to minimize the role of writing other than George Eliot's in helping to bring about the James of the *Portrait* and *The Bostonians*. *Maule's Curse* is alluded to, and the 'American' side of Henry James's work is certainly not ignored (see especially pp. 10-11), but Mr. Leavis so far plays down the 'Hawthorne aspect' (a phrase of T. S. Eliot, who can suitably be invoked here) that he can describe *The Ambassadors*, whose deepest subject is 'the door we never opened into the rose-garden' as a bad novel, and do much less than justice to the greatest of James's tragedies, *The Wings of the Dove*. (Milly Theale, Mr. Leavis says quaintly, isn't 'there'. Are Perdita, Miranda, Marina, 'there'?) Then what is said (not very much) of Turgenev is also quite misleading. (Several of Mr. Leavis's remarks on foreign writers are odd; he finds Marcel Proust—that notable admirer of George Eliot—barely readable, having possibly been biased in his approach here by L. H. Myers's misunderstanding of Proust's intention.) And it may be doubted whether James's abandonment of 'Paris' was quite so peremptory and final as Mr. Leavis supposes. Some of the cobwebbiness Mr. Leavis complains of in the later James (Mr. F. O. Matthiessen's 'major phase') may be ascribed to a conception, still Flaubertian, of *métier*. And this also helped powerfully to direct the technical developments of Conrad.

These last, however, in their more exotic aspects, Mr. Leavis does not deal with. Conrad's characteristic transformation of the old epic process of exposition, narrative, and solution is hardly suggested, and the adaptation of Turgenev's method of indirect narration, though so profoundly important for Conrad, is not mentioned. In compensation Mr. Leavis brings out more vividly than any other critic the artistic necessity to Conrad both of the English language and of the heroic 'positives' of the Master Mariner, and shows the deep connexion between the two. The Conrad Mr. Leavis admires is the Conrad, not of *Lord Jim* or *Youth* or 'the sea', but the Conrad of *The Secret Agent*, *Under Western Eyes*, *Victory*, *Chance* and, above all, of *Nostromo*. The detailed discussion of this Conrad is, within its imposed limits, subtle and convincing. But again the insistent and slightly artificial emphasis on the 'English tradition' is distorting. Thus Mr. Leavis makes Conrad's 'higher melodrama' seem too much like a direct development out of Dickens's. Conrad did not care for Dickens, but refrained from saying so in print because of his fear of being thought too typically

'foreign' in this attitude. The Dickens element in Conrad, especially of the middle period, is undoubtedly there, but it is partly mediated through Dostoevsky. Conrad as artist is a foreign writer learning from foreign writers. But so, to a greater extent than Mr. Leavis will concede, is James. And there is, anyway, a *prima-facie* difficulty in accepting as the central part of an English tradition three novelists of whom only one was English. If Mr. Leavis had allowed his book to broaden into a study of the development of the poem-novel in English, this difficulty would have been more smoothed over; the characteristic virtues of his approach would have been retained and we would not have had to accept, as tightly bound up with it, a 'tradition' in which Dickens is not central, in which *Wuthering Heights* is an inexplicable freak, and Hardy a 'provincial manufacturer of gauche and heavy fictions'. Mr. Leavis, it is true, admits that Dickens is a great and 'central' poet-novelist: but with only one masterpiece, *Hard Times*. Surely *Great Expectations*, a much more distinguished novel, in every way, than *Hard Times*, would have served Mr. Leavis's purpose better—if Dickens has to be reduced to a one-book man. Mr. Leavis is often accused of being over-rigorous, but *this* is certainly not what is wrong with his essay on *Hard Times*. On the contrary: Mr. Leavis seems to find in the presentational rhetoric of this book the finest of poetry. Even Dickens's biggest crudities here are accepted as deep insights into Victorian civilization. [It is hard to believe that Mr. Leavis meant the comparison of Tom Gradgrind's schooling with J. S. Mill's (p. 228) to be taken seriously.] *Hard Times* is a remarkable novel, but Dickens showed in other works than this far more understanding of the things he hated. Yet even here, where Mr. Leavis is not at his best, the discussion is continuously stimulating. Throughout Mr. Leavis has fulfilled at least part of his aim in raising so many problems at so high a level; and his book as a whole is a major contribution to English criticism.

Forms of Modern Fiction is a collection of American essays, a *Festschrift* for a distinguished critic; its common subject-matter is the technique and form of the novel. The quality of the book is uneven, and the most internationally celebrated of the writers represented here are not seen at their best. Mr. Allen Tate seems to lose the thread of his argument in *Techniques of Fiction*, Mr. T. S. Eliot's *Ulysses* article (dated 1923) is a period piece, and Professor Trilling on *Manners, Morals and the Novel* rambles over a wide ground without any obvious purpose, though he says some interesting things (not all of them convincing) about Cervantes. There are some failures of touch and tone. Mr. E. K. Brown says of E. M. Forster: 'He would writhe to hear it, but he is the lawful issue of George Eliot' (p. 164). Mr. Frederick J. Hoffman finds Aldous Huxley's novels 'a brilliant portrait of the age' (p. 200). Mr. Ray B. West, Jun., thinks Hemingway an American Donne. But there are good things said in special contexts all over the book; and Mr. Mark Schorer's general essay, (with some qualifications) Mr. Penn Warren on William Faulkner, and above all Mr. C. W. M. Johnson's distinguished, though brief, study of Proust's style, may be in particular recommended to all those for whom the novel is more than an interlude of pastime amid a general listlessness.

W. W. ROBSON

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

ANGLIA

Band lxix, Heft 1, 1950

Geschichte der englischen Marienlyrik im Mittelalter (Theodor Wolpers), pp. 3-88.

Chaucers Konstanze und die Legende der guten Frauen (Maria Wickert), pp. 89-104.

Die Bedeutung der kosmischen Konzeption in Miltons Dichtung (Edgar Mertner), pp. 105-34.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xi, No. 3, June 1950

Restoration tragedy: a reconsideration (Clifford Leech), pp. 106-15.

ELH

Vol. xvii, No. 2, June 1950

Talus (Geoffrey Wagner), pp. 79-86.

[In Spenser.]

The ending of *Hamlet* as a farewell to Essex (Edward S. Le Comte), pp. 87-114.

W. B. Yeats: a poet's stagecraft, 1899-1911 (Thomas Parkinson), pp. 136-61.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxi, No. 3, June 1950

Loss and consolation in the poetry of Wordsworth (1798-1805) (C. Clarke), pp. 81-97.

'To maken of fern-asshen glas' (F. de Tollenaere), pp. 97-9.

[Chaucer's *Squire's Tale*, 246.]

A note on Dryden's 'All for Love', V. 165 ff. (H. Kossmann), pp. 99-100.

Points of Modern English Syntax (P. A. Erades), pp. 121-4.

[Continued, xxxi. 153-7.]

Vol. xxxi, No. 4, August 1950

The background and sources of Preston's *Cambises* (W. A. Armstrong), pp. 129-35.

Notes on *Hamlet* (Kristian Smidt), pp. 136-41.

FURMAN STUDIES

Vol. xxxiii, No. 5, Spring 1950

Wordsworth's philosophy of education (Francis W. Bonner), pp. 1-26.

An introduction to a study of Wordsworth's reading in science (Charles L. Pittman), pp. 27-60.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. *xiii*, No. 3, May 1950

Dramatic emphasis in *All's Well That Ends Well* (Harold S. Wilson), pp. 217-40.

Moral guidance and religious encouragement for the Elizabethan soldier (Paul A. Jorgensen), pp. 241-59.

Standards of taste advocated for feminine letter writing, 1640-1797 (Sister Mary Humiliata), pp. 261-77.

Defoe, Steele, and the demolition of Dunkirk (John Robert Moore), pp. 279-302.

The date of Milton's *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* (J. Max Patrick), pp. 303-11.

Coleridge's criticism of Jeremy Taylor (R. Florence Brinkley), pp. 313-23.

Sir Egerton Brydges on Lord Byron (W. Powell Jones), pp. 325-37.

LONDON MEDIEVAL STUDIES

Vol. *i*, Part 3 (1939), 1948

A York Pageant, 1486 (A. H. Smith), pp. 382-98.

Robert or William Longland? (R. W. Chambers), pp. 430-62.

Relationships of the Trevisa manuscripts and Caxton's *Polycronycon* (A. C. Cawley), pp. 463-82.

Notes on the C-text of *Piers Plowman* (A. G. Mitchell), pp. 483-92.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. *lxv*, No. 6, June 1950

Melville as a critic of science (Tyrus Hillway), pp. 411-14.

The novel that occasioned Newman's *Loss and Gain* (Charlotte E. Crawford), pp. 414-18.

Tourneur and *Little Gidding*; Corbière and *East Coker* (Grover Smith), pp. 418-21.

Eliot's 'Game of Chess' and Conrad's 'The Return' (Robert L. Morris), pp. 422-3.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. *xlvi*, No. 2, April 1950

The canon of William Rowley's plays (Dewar M. Robb), pp. 129-41.

The technique of invocation in 'King Lear' (J. C. Maxwell), pp. 142-7.

Shakespeare or Heminge? A rejoinder and a surrejoinder (H. David Gray and Percy Simpson), pp. 148-52.

Extracts from the destroyed letters of Richard Hurd to William Mason (James Nankivell), pp. 153-63.

The eighteenth-century vogue of 'Malbrough' and Marlborough (C. D. Brenner), pp. 177-80.

Caxton and Gower (J. A. W. Bennett), pp. 215-16.

'The pale cast of thought' (Gwyn Williams), pp. 216-18.

Did Smollett know Spanish? (John Orr), p. 218.

Newman's 'Callista' and the Catholic Popular Library (Charlotte E. Crawford), pp. 219-21.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. xlvii, No. 4, May 1950

A note on Milton's use of Machiavelli's *Discorsi* (Joseph Allen Bryant, Jr.), pp. 217-21.

Victorian bibliography for 1949, pp. 253-82.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

34ste Jaarg., Afl. 3, 1 Juli 1950

The Player's speech in *Hamlet*. A new approach (D. R. Godfrey), pp. 162-9.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN (Helsinki)

Vol. I, Nos. 5-8, 1949

English in Nicole Bozon's *Contes Moralisés* (Alan S. C. Ross), pp. 200-20.

Zu den mittenglischen Ratschlägen des Vaters (F. Holthausen), pp. 220-3.

Vol. II, Nos. 1-2, 1950

Hurly-burly, Hallaloo, Hullabaloo (Gösta Langenfelt), pp. 1-18.

Vol. II, Nos. 3-4, 1950

Notes on some Old English glosses in Aldhelm's *De Laudibus Virginitatis* (Tauno F. Mustanoja), pp. 49-61.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. cxcv. No. 11, 27 May 1950

Chaucer in mythical pedigrees (E. A. Greening Lamborn), pp. 222-3.

The apostasy of Nicholas Udall (William L. Edgerton), pp. 223-7.

The early references to John Donne (W. Milgate), pp. 229-31.

[Continued, 10 June, pp. 246-7; 8 July, pp. 290-2.]

The name of God and 'The Duchess of Malfi' (G. P. V. Akrigg), pp. 231-3.

Shylock's name (M. A. Shaaber), p. 236.

Vol. cxcv, No. 12, 10 June 1950

The Columbia Milton. Fourth supplement (Thomas Ollive Mabbott, J. Milton French, and Maurice Kelley), pp. 244-6.

A factual interpretation of 'The Changeling's' madhouse scenes (Robert R. Reed, Jr.), pp. 247-8.

'A Tale of a Tub': a correction (J. C. Maxwell), p. 249.

Notes on Johnson's Dictionary (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 249-50.

[See *N. & Q.*, cxcv. 167.]

Junius and Milton (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 250-1.

Coleridge as 'The Wedding Guest' in the 'Rime of the Ancient Mariner' (Howard Parsons), pp. 251-2.

A Byron letter (Frederick L. Jones), p. 252.

An early poem by Mrs. Browning (Gardner Taplin), pp. 252-3.

Keats and 'Hamlet' (R. F. Rashbrook), pp. 253-4.

384 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Hans Ewouts, artist of the Tudor court theatre (Abraham Feldman), pp. 257-8.

Yeats, Noyes, and Day Lewis (George Brandon Saul), p. 258.

Vol. cxcv, No. 13, 24 June 1950

Ben Jonson's pioneering in sentimental comedy (Robert R. Reed, Jr.), pp. 272-3.

Good Advice to the Ladies. A note on Daniel Defoe (Andrew M. Wilkinson), pp. 273-5.

'The Spectator' No. 543 (A. D. Atkinson), p. 275.

A new note on Ralph Waldo Emerson, public official (F. B. Dedmond), pp. 278-9.

Dickens: two curious idioms (V. R.), p. 279.

Vol. cxcv, No. 14, 8 July 1950

'Sommers heate' again (Laurence Michel), pp. 292-3.
[In Daniel's *Civil Wars*.]

'The Tempest', III. i. 13-17 (H. W. Jones), pp. 293-4.

'The Tempest': further emendations (Howard Parsons), pp. 294-5.

The goose in 'Lear' (Graham Jones), p. 295.

Christopher Stubbe: Tudor lawyer and son-in-law of John Heywood (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 295-6.

Boswell and literary property (Colin J. Horne), pp. 296-8.

A simile in 'Samson Agonistes' (Peter Ure), p. 298.

Some notes on the Ossianic controversy (Catherine A. Sheehan), pp. 300-2.

Maturin's birth-date (A. M. Buchan), p. 302.

Blake's 'Head Downwards' (Norman Nathan), pp. 302-3.

Vol. cxcv, No. 15, 22 July 1950

'What Greater Delight?' (Michael Barrington), pp. 312-14.
[Gerard's *Herball*.]

'2 Henry IV'; Epilogue 30 (J. C. Maxwell), p. 314.

Yahoos and Houyhnhnms (Frank Kermode), pp. 317-18.

The authorship of Yorick's 'Sentimental Journey Continued' (Karl F. Thompson), pp. 318-19.

John Miller—associate with Woodfall in the printing of the Junius Letters (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 319-20.

Chatterton on money (Harold H. Scudder), pp. 323-4.

Helena Landless (E. O. Winstedt), p. 325.

Two unique gender forms in the Shakespeare sonnets (Murray Abend), p. 325.

Vol. cxcv, No. 16, 5 August 1950

A heraldic allusion in 'Henry V' (Martin Holmes), p. 333.

The Book of the Duchess: vv. 16-21 (Mortimer J. Donovan), pp. 333-4.

Bacon's licence to travel beyond the seas (Roderick L. Eagle), p. 334.

Satan's artillery (Harold H. Scudder), pp. 334-7.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 385

'The Revenger's Tragedy': a neglected source (Samuel Schoenbaum), p. 338.

Dr. Johnson and science—I (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 338-41.

'The Hag' in 'The Cloud' (James E. Cronin), pp. 341-2.
[Herrick and Shelley.]

Johnson's 'Falling Houses' (John Robert Moore), p. 342.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xi, No. 2, Winter 1950

The Infinite Sea. The development and decline of Wordsworth and Coleridge. An account of Professor Harper's unfinished book (Carlos Baker), pp. 62-75.

Wordsworth's voice of calm (Gilbert T. Dunklin), pp. 76-88.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Vol. lxxv, No. 4, June 1950

What is the stream of consciousness technique? (Lawrence Edward Bowling), pp. 333-45.

Simms and the British dramatists (C. Hugh Holman), pp. 346-59.
[Nineteenth-century American novelist.]

The date of Emerson's *Terminus* (Carl F. Strauch), pp. 360-70.

Twenty unpublished letters of Elizabeth Barrett to Hugh Stuart Boyd (Bennett Weaver), pp. 397-418.

Coleridge's use of Wordsworth's juvenilia (Jane Worthington Smyser), pp. 419-26.

The Johnsonian canon: a neglected attribution (D. J. Greene), pp. 427-34.

The inherent values of eighteenth-century personification (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 435-63.

Polygamy in early fiction: Henry Neville and Denis Veiras (A. Owen Aldridge), pp. 464-72.

The sources of Massinger's *Emperour of the East* (Peter G. Phialas), pp. 473-82.

Chaucer's prose rhythms (Margaret Schlauch), pp. 568-89.

A Middle English treatise on hermeneutics, Harley MS. 2276, 32^v-35^v (R. H. Bowers), pp. 590-600.

Gaimar's early 'Danish' Kings (Alexander Bell), pp. 601-40.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURE MODERNE

Anno I, N. 1. Luglio 1950

Terza rima: a footnote on English prosody (John Wain), pp. 44-8.

STUDIES IN BIBLIOGRAPHY. PAPERS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Vol. ii, 1949-50

The early editions and issues of *The Monk*, with a bibliography (William B. Todd), pp. 3-24.

The 'Second Issue' of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, 1609 (Philip Williams, Jr.), pp. 25-33.

Warburton, Hanmer, and the 1745 edition of Shakespeare (Giles E. Dawson), pp. 35-48.

The library of Elizabeth's embezzling teller (Leslie Hotson), pp. 49-61.
[Richard Stonley.]

Melville and the Shakers (Merton M. Sealts, Jr.), pp. 105-14.

A bibliographical study of *Parthenissa* by Roger Boyle Earl of Orrery (C. William Miller), pp. 115-37.

Dryden's *Indian Emperour*: the early editions and their relation to the text (James S. Steck), pp. 139-52.

Bibliographical evidence from the printer's measure (Fredson Bowers), pp. 153-67.

[Based on Restoration plays.]

The publication of Steele's *Conscious Lovers* (Rodney M. Baine), pp. 169-73.
A note on *King Lear*, III. ii. 1-3 (George W. Williams), pp. 175-82.

The twelfth Day of December: *Twelfth Night*, II. iii. 91 (I. B. Cauthen, Jr.), pp. 182-5.

The Dryden *Troilus and Cressida* imprint: another theory (Paul S. Dunkin), pp. 185-9.

Sir Thomas Browne: early biographical notices, and the disposition of his library and manuscripts (Jeremiah S. Finch), pp. 196-201.

The cancels in Lockman's *Travels of the Jesuits*, 1743 (Jessie R. Lucke), pp. 205-7.

STUDIER I MODERN SPRÅKVETENSKAP (STOCKHOLM)

Vol. xvii, 1949

Middle English dialects (O. Arngart), pp. 17-29.

Native, Classical or Romance? Etymology and accentuation in English (Bror Danielsson), pp. 30-8.

An early London text (Eilert Ekwall), pp. 39-46.
[*The Prisoner's Prayer*, c. 1250.]

Literary contributions (Gösta Langenfelt), pp. 47-86.

Nine English etymologies (Kemp Malone), pp. 95-100.

Puns and publicity (Urban Ohlander), pp. 101-21.

French guests in English literature (Karin Ringenson), pp. 122-38.

The -'s genitive of non-personal nouns in present-day English (Hilding Svartengren), pp. 139-80.

Three Middle English Bahuvrīhi adjectives (Erik Tengstrand), pp. 210-26.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. xlvii, No. 2, April 1950

Poems attributed to Sir Philip Sidney (William Ringler), pp. 126-51.

Machiavelli and Sidney: the *Arcadia* of 1590 (Irving Ribner), pp. 152-72.

New light on stage directions in Shakespeare (Warren Smith), pp. 173-81.

'Twenty good nights'—*The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, *The Family of Love*, and *Romeo and Juliet* (W. J. Olive), pp. 182-9.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 387

Milton's dual concept of God as related to Creation (Walter Clyde Curry), pp. 190-210.

The names of Milton's angels (Robert H. West), pp. 211-23.

Milton bejesuited (George F. Sensabaugh), pp. 224-42.

Recent literature of the Renaissance: a bibliography, pp. 245-449.

Vol. xlvii, No. 3, July 1950

Malory and the stanzaic *Le Morte Arthur* (E. Talbot Donaldson), pp. 460-72.

Phyllyp Sparowe: Titulus (Robert S. Kinsman), pp. 473-84.

The uncertain author of Poem 225, Tottel's *Miscellany* (A. Stuart Daley), 485-93.

Spenser, *Shepheardes Calendar*, March ll. 61-114, and The Variorum Edition (Leo Spitzer), pp. 494-505.

John Dryden's interest in judicial astrology (William Bradford Gardner), pp. 506-21.

Coleridge's self-identification with Spenserian characters (Charles E. Mounts), pp. 522-33.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January-June 1950

[Unless otherwise stated, the date of each publication is 1950.]

ALBRECHT, W. P. William Hazlitt and the Malthusian Controversy. Albuquerque. pp. 124. \$1.00.

ALLEN, D. C. (ed.). A Strange Metamorphosis of Man, Transformed into a Wilderness. Baltimore, 1949. pp. xviii + 64. 27s.

AMERY, L. S. Thought and Language. London, 1949. pp. 19. 3s. 6d.

ANDERSON, G. K. The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons. London. pp. x + 431. 30s.

ARNOLD, M. The Poetical Works, ed. C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry. London. pp. xxxii + 509. 8s. 6d.

ATKINS, S. P. The Testament of Werther in Poetry and Drama. Cambridge, Mass., 1949. pp. xiv + 322. \$4.50; 36s.

BAKER, J. E. (ed.). The Reinterpretation of Victorian Literature. Princeton, N.J. pp. x + 236. 24s.

BATESON, F. W. English Poetry. A Critical Introduction. London. pp. x + 272. 10s. 6d.

BEATTIE, W. (ed.). The Chepman and Myllar Prints. Edinburgh. pp. xxviii + 220. 84s.

BIRRELL, T. A. Catholic Allegiance and

the Popish Plot. Nijmegen. pp. 18. Fl. 1.

BOAS, F. S. Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies. London. pp. 212. 15s.
— Thomas Heywood. London. pp. 159. 8s. 6d.

— (ed.). The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. xxviii, 1947. London, 1949. pp. 290. 12s. 6d.

BOWERS, F. Principles of Bibliographical Description. Princeton, N.J., 1949. pp. xviii + 505. 63s.

BOYCE, B. (ed.). The Adventures of Lindamira. Minneapolis, 1949. pp. xviii + 167. \$3.00.

BREDVOLD, L. I. The Contributions of John Wilkes to the *Gazette Littéraire de l'Europe*. Ann Arbor. pp. 36. \$0.75.

BRERETON, J. LE GAY. Writings on Elizabethan Drama. Melbourne, 1948. pp. 115. 7s. 6d.

BUSH, D. Science and English Poetry. New York. pp. x + 166. 16s.

BUTLER, E. M. Goethe and Byron. Nottingham. pp. 28. 1s. 6d.

COMETTI, ELIZABETH (ed.). Jefferson's Ideas on a University Library. Charlottesville, Va. pp. 50. \$2.00.

- COSMO, U. A Handbook to Dante Studies. Oxford. pp. vi+194. 15s.
- COULSON, D. J. Prose Craft. London. pp. 96. 3s. 6d.
- CUNNINGHAM, G. F. Translations from Goethe. Edinburgh, 1949. pp. x+86. 6s.
- DARBISHIRE, HELEN. The Poet Wordsworth. Oxford. pp. viii+182. 7s. 6d.
- DORIAN, D. C. The English Diadotis. New Brunswick. pp. xviii+365. \$5.00.
- DRAPER, J. W. The Twelfth Night of Shakespeare's Audience. Stanford, Calif. pp. xiv+280. \$5.00.
- DUTHIE, G. I. Elizabethan Shorthand and the First Quarto of *King Lear*. Oxford. pp. iv+82. 10s. 6d.
- FARNHAM, W. Shakespeare's Tragic Frontier. Berkeley and Los Angeles. pp. viii+289. 27s. 6d.
- FINCH, G. A. The Development of the Fiction of Henry James from 1879 to 1886. New York, 1949. pp. iv+19. No price given.
- FOGLE, R. H. The Imagery of Keats and Shelley. Chapel Hill, 1949. pp. xii+296. \$4.00; 32s.
- FORSBERG, R. A Contribution to a Dictionary of Old English Place-Names. Uppsala. pp. xvi+225. No price given.
- FOX, SIR C., and B. DICKINS (eds.). The Early Cultures of North-West Europe. Cambridge. pp. xvi+441. 63s.
- FRANKLIN, B., and G. LEGMAN. David Ricardo and Ricardian Theory. A Bibliographical Checklist. New York, 1949. pp. viii+88. \$6.50.
- FRAUNCE, A. The Arcadian Rhetorike. Ed. Ethel Seaton. Oxford. pp. lvi+136. 30s.
- FRENCH, J. M. (ed.). The Life Records of John Milton. Vol. i, 1608-1639. New Brunswick, 1949. pp. xii+446. \$5.00.
- GIBSON, S. A Bibliography of Francis Kirkman. (O.B.S., vol. i, fasc. ii, 1947.) Oxford, 1949. pp. 47-152. No price given.
- GRABO, C. H. Shelley's Eccentricities. Albuquerque. pp. 84. \$1.00.
- GRAHAM, J., Jr. (ed.). Letters of Thomas Carlyle to William Graham. Princeton, N.J. pp. xx+86. 16s.
- GREG, W. W. The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus. A Conjectural Reconstruction. Oxford. pp. x+66. 7s. 6d.
- (ed.). Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* 1604-1616. Parallel Texts. Oxford. pp. xiv+408. 42s.
- GREIG, J. Y. T. Thackeray. A Reconsideration. London. pp. viii+216. 12s. 6d.
- GUERARD, A. J. Thomas Hardy. The Novels and Stories. Cambridge, Mass., 1949. pp. xiv+177. 15s.
- HAYWARD, J. (comp.). English Poetry. An Illustrated Catalogue. Cambridge, 1949. pp. x+148+381 plates. 84s.
- HOLADAY, A. Thomas Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece*. Urbana. pp. x+185. \$3.00.
- HOTSON, L. Shakespeare's Sonnets Dated and Other Essays. London, 1949. pp. xii+244. 21s.
- JACK, A. A. Young Hamlet. Aberdeen. pp. xxx+176. 8s. 6d.
- KIRBY, T. A., and H. B. WOOLF (eds.). Philologica: The Malone Anniversary Studies. Baltimore, 1949. pp. x+382. 60s.
- KÜHNELT, H. H. Die Bedeutung von Edgar Allan Poe für die englische Literatur. Innsbruck, 1949. pp. 320. No price given.
- LEGGE, M. DOMINICA. Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters. Edinburgh. pp. viii+147. 14s. 6d.
- LOEWENBERG, A. (comp.). The Theatre of the British Isles excluding London. A Bibliography. London. pp. x+75. No price given.
- LOHR, EVELYN. Patristic Demonology in Old English Literature. New York, 1949. pp. 17. No price given.
- LOTHIAN, J. M. King Lear. A Tragic Reading of Life. Toronto, 1949. pp. viii+101. \$1.50; 7s. 6d.
- LOVELL, E. J., Jr. Byron: The Record of a Quest. Austin, Tx., 1949. pp. viii+270. No price given.
- LYON, J. S. *The Excursion*. A Study. New Haven. pp. xiv+154. 24s.
- MACDONALD, H. (ed.). Englands Helicon. London. pp. xxviii+260. 8s. 6d.
- MACGILLIVRAY, J. R. Keats. A Bibliography and Reference Guide. Toronto, 1949. pp. lxxxii+210. \$5.00; 37s. 6d.
- MCINTOSH, A. Wulfstan's Prose. London. pp. 36. 8s.
- MATTHEWS, W. (comp.). British Diaries. A Bibliography, 1442-1942. Berkeley and Los Angeles. pp. xxxiv+339. 27s. 6d.
- MILTON, J. Complete Poetical Works reproduced in Photographic Facsimile. Vols. iii and iv. Urbana, 1948. pp. vi+455; vi+316. \$20.00 each or \$60.00 the set of four volumes.
- O'CONNOR, W. V. Sense and Sensibility in Modern Poetry. Chicago, 1948. pp. xii+279. 30s.
- OPPEL, H. Der späte Shakespeare. Hamburg, 1949. pp. 43. DM. 2.40.
- Die Kunst des Erzählens im englischen Roman des 19. Jahrhundert. Bielefeld. pp. 79. DM. 2.80.
- OSBORNE, MARY T. (ed.). Advice-to-a Painter Poems 1633-1856. An Annotated Finding List. Austin, 1949. pp. 92. No price given.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

389

- PARROTT, T. M. *Shakespearean Comedy*. New York, 1949. pp. xiv+417. \$6.50; 38s.
- PEERY, W. (ed.). *The Plays of Nathan Field*. Austin. pp. xiv+346. \$3.75.
- PETTET, E. C. *Shakespeare and the Romantic Tradition*. London, 1949. pp. 208. 12s. 6d.
- ROBERTSON, D. A., Jr. (ed.). *English Institute Essays 1948*. New York, 1949. pp. x+219. \$3.00; 24s.
- ROBINSON, R. *Definition*. Oxford. pp. viii+207. 15s.
- ROBINSON, W. H., Ltd. *Phillipps Manuscript 8336*. London. pp. 25. No price given.
- ROONEY, W. J. *The Problem of 'Poetry and Belief' in Contemporary Criticism*. Washington, D.C., 1949. pp. x+165. \$1.75.
- SCHOFIELD, B. (ed.). *The Knyvett Letters (1620-1644)*. London, 1949. pp. 182. 21s.
- SHINE, H. (ed.). *Booker Memorial Studies*. Chapel Hill. pp. xiv+183. 32s.
- and MARY C. SHINE. *The Quarterly Review under Gifford*. Chapel Hill, 1949. pp. xxiv+108. \$3.00; 24s.
- SKELTON, R. A. *Punctuation in a Nutshell*. London, 1949. pp. iv+18. 2s.
- SKELTON, R. *Modern English Punctuation (2nd edn.)*. London, 1949. pp. vi+234. 15s.
- SMIDT, K. *Poetry and Belief in the Work of T. S. Eliot*. Oslo, 1949. pp. 228. Kr. 15.00.
- SMITH, D. N. *John Dryden*. Cambridge. pp. viii+93. 7s. 6d.
- SOUTHWORTH, J. G. *Some Modern American Poets*. Oxford. pp. viii+180. 10s. 6d.
- SUNDBY, B. *The Dialect and Provenance of the Middle English poem *The Owl and the Nightingale**. Lund. pp. 218. Sw. Kr. 12.
- TILLOTSON, G. *The Manner of Proceeding in Certain Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth-Century Poems*. London. pp. 30. 4s. 6d.
- TROLLOPE, A. *The Eustace Diamonds*. Preface by M. Sadleir. London. 2 vols. Vol. i, pp. xvi+361; Vol. ii, pp. viii+383. 30s.
- TYLER, M. C. *A History of American Literature 1607-1765*. Ithaca, 1949. pp. xxxiv+551. \$6.00; 48s.
- WAGNER, B. M. (ed.). *The Appreciation of Shakespeare*. Washington, 1949. pp. xiv+482+40. \$5.00.
- WATERHOUSE, MARY E. *Beowulf in Modern English*. Cambridge. pp. xx+129. 10s. 6d.
- WELLS, EVELYN K. *The Ballad Tree*. New York. pp. x+370. \$4.50.
- WILLARD, C. B. *Whitman's American Fame*. Providence, R.I. pp. x+269. \$4.00.
- WRIGHT, NATHALIA. *Melville's Use of the Bible*. Durham, N.C., 1949. pp. x+208. 26s.

INDEX

- Adams, Joseph Quincy. See McManaway, J. G.
- Adams, M. R., *Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism, with special references to the French Revolution*, revd., 76
- Addison, Joseph. See Wheatley, Katherine E.
- Allott, K. See Habington, William
- Altick, R. D., *The Cowden Clarkes*, revd., 372
- Ames, R., *Citizen Thomas More and His Utopia*, revd., 253
- Andrew, S. O., *Postscript on Beowulf*, revd., 353
- Aristotle. See Lees, F. N.
- Arnold, Matthew. See Tillotson, Kathleen
- Aspinall, A., *Politics and the Press, c. 1780-1850*, revd., 273
- Austen, Jane. See Hogan, C. B. (art.); Chapman, R. W. (revd.)
- Bacon, Francis. See Lees, F. N.
- Baum, Helena Watts, *The Satiric & the Didactic in Ben Jonson's Comedy*, revd., 166
- Beach, Joseph Warren. See O'Connor, W. Van
- Belleforest, F. de, *The French Bandello: a Selection. The original text of four of B's Histoires Tragiques translated by Geoffrey Fenton and William Painter. Anno 1567*, ed. F. S. Hook, revd., 62
- Bennett, H. S., *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century*, revd., 155
- Bennett, Joan, *George Eliot. Her Mind and Her Art*, revd., 177
- Beowulf. See Andrew, S. O.
- Bethell, S. L., art. by, *Shakespeare's Actors*, 193
- Beyer, W. W., *Keats and the Daemon King*, revd., 80
- Blake, William. See Davies, J. G., Keynes, G. (revd.)
- Bland, D. S., note by, *Mary Barton and Historical Accuracy*, 58
- Boas, G., *Essays on Primitivism and Related Ideas in the Middle Ages*, revd., 159
- Boccaccio, Giovanni. See Wright, H. G.
- Bowden, Muriel, *A Commentary on the General Prologue to the Canterbury Tales*, revd., 357
- Bradbrook, M. C., art. by, *Virtue is the True Nobility: A Study of the Structure of All's Well that Ends Well*, 289.
- Brontë, Emily Jane, *Five Essays Written in French*, trs. Lorinne W. Nagel, introd. by Fannie E. Ratchford, noticed, 185.
- Brook, G. L. See *Harley Lyrics*
- Brown, W. C., *The Triumph of Form. A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet*, revd., 366
- Bunyan, John. See Talon, H. A.
- Butt, J., note by, *David Copperfield: From Manuscript to Print*, 247
- Carter, J., *Taste and Technique in Book-collecting*, revd., 183
- Catharine, Countess of Suffolk, *Letters of*. Part I, noticed, 184
- Chapman, R., art. by, *The Wheel of Fortune in Shakespeare's Historical Plays*, 1
- Chapman, R. W., *Jane Austen. Facts and Problems*, revd., 368; notes by, Crousaz on Pope, 57, *The Reading Public in 1803*, 144; letter on the Naming of Characters, 252
- Charlton, H. B., *Shakespearian Tragedy*, revd., 163
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. See Bennett, H. S., Bowden, Muriel, Rickert, Edith (revd.)
- Chettle, Henry. See Thomas, S.
- Chrétien de Troyes. See Loomis, R. S.
- Clapp, Sarah L. C. See Tonson, Jacob
- Clarke, Charles and Mary Cowden. See Altick, R. D.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. See Whalley, G.
- Craig, H., *An Interpretation of Shakespeare*, revd., 259
- Croston, A. K. See Fairfax, N., and Whitlock, R.
- Crousaz, J.-P. de. See Chapman, R. W.
- Crow, M. M. See Rickert, Edith
- Davies, J. G., *The Theology of William Blake*, revd., 77
- Dawson, G. E. See McManaway, J. G.
- Defoe, Daniel, *An Essay on the Regulation of the Press*, with introd. by J. R. Moore, noticed, 280
- Dickens, Charles. See Butt, J.
- Dilworth, E. N., *The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne*, revd., 364
- Donne, John. See Simpson, Evelyn M.
- Dryden, John. See Horsman, E. A.
- Duncan-Jones, Elsie Elizabeth, letter on the Naming of Characters, 252
- Eliot, George. See Bennett, Joan
- Ellis-Fermor, U., *Shakespeare the Dramatist*, revd., 163
- Elson, J. H., *John Hales of Eton*, revd., 174
- Emden, C. S., art. by, *Dr. Johnson and Imagery*, 23
- English Institute Essays, 1947, revd., 278
- English Studies 1948, coll. F. P. Wilson, revd., 86
- Fairfax, Nathaniel, *A Treatise of the Bulk and Selvedge of the World*, Preface to, ed. A. K. Croston in *Two Seventeenth-Century Prefaces* [cf. Whitlock, R.], noticed, 280

Fenton, Geoffrey. See Belleforest, F. de
 FitzGerald, Edward. See Terhune, A. McK.
 Fitzgerald, Margaret M., *First Follow
 Nature. Primitivism in English Poetry
 1725-1750*, revd., 75
 Flatter, R., *Shakespeare's Producing Hand*,
 revd., 66
 Fletcher, John, and others, *Rollo, Duke of
 Normandy or The Bloody Brother*, ed.
 J. D. Jump, revd., 360
 Foerster, D., *Homer in English Criticism*,
 noticed, 91
 Freeman, Rosemary, *English Emblem Books*,
 revd., 168
 Gaskell, Elizabeth Cleghorn. See Bland,
 D. S.
 Gilbert, A. H., *On the Composition of
 Paradise Lost: A Study of the Ordering
 and Insertion of Material*, revd., 268
 Gildon, Charles. See Maxwell, J. C.
*Good Wife, The, taught her Daughter. The
 Good Wife would a Pylgemage. The
 Theosis of Gud Women*, ed. T. F. Mus-
 tanoja, revd., 61
 Gray, J. E., art. by, *The Source of The
 Emperor of the East*, 126
 Greig, J. A., *Francis Jeffrey of the Edin-
 burgh Review*, revd., 82
 Greville, Fulke. See Ure, P.
 Guttman, Selma, *The Foreign Sources of
 Shakespeare's Works*, noticed, 91
 Habington, William. *The Poems of W. H.*,
 ed. K. Allott, revd., 266
 Hales, John. See Elson, J. H.
 Hammond, L. van der H., *Laurence Sterne's
 'Sermons of Mr. Yorick'*, revd., 364
*Harley Lyrics, The: The Middle English
 Lyrics of MS. Harley 2253*, ed. G. L.
 Brook, revd., 158
 Hausted, Peter, *Semile Odium*, ed. and trs.
 L. J. Mills, revd., 264
 Hazen, A. T., *A Bibliography of Horace
 Walpole*, revd., 172
 Hogan, C. B., art. by, *Jane Austen and her
 Early Public*, 39
 Holloway, Sr. M. M., *The Prosodic Theory
 of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, noticed, 186
 Homer. See Foerster, D.
 Hook, F. S. See Belleforest, F. de
 Hopkins, Gerard Manley. See Holloway,
 Sr. M. M.
 Hoppe, H. R., *The Bad Quarto of 'Romeo
 and Juliet': a bibliographical and textual
 study*, revd., 64
 Horsman, E. A., note by, *Dryden's French
 Borrowings*, 346
 Hughes, L., and Scouten, A. H., ed. *Ten
 English Farces*, revd., 368
 James, D. G., *The Romantic Comedy*, revd.,
 78
 James, Henry, *The Art of Fiction and other
 Essays by H. J.*, with introd. by M.
 Roberts, revd., 179; *The Notebooks of*

H. J., ed. F. O. Matthiessen and K. B.
 Murdock, revd., 179
 Jeffares, A. N., *W. B. Yeats: Man and
 Poet*, revd., 375
 Jeffrey, Francis. See Greig, J. A.
 Johnson, Samuel. See Emden, C. S. (art.);
 Tillotson, Kathleen (note); McNair, A.
 (revd.)
 Jonson, Ben. See Scheve, D. A. (note);
 Baum, Helena Watts, Sackton, A. H.
 (revd.)
 Joseph, B. L., note by, *A Seventeenth-
 century Guide to Character Writing*, 144
 Jump, J. D. See Fletcher, John
 Keats, John. See Beyer, W. W.
 Kermode, F., art. by, *The Private Imagery
 of Henry Vaughan*, 206
 Keynes, G., *Blake Studies. Notes on his
 Life and Works in Seventeen Chapters*,
 revd., 271
 Lacey, N., *Wordsworth's View of Nature
 and its Ethical Consequences*, revd., 370
 Lawlor, J. J., art. by, *The Tragic Conflict
 in Hamlet*, 97
 Leavis, F. R., *The Great Tradition*, revd.,
 377
 Lees, F. N., art. by, *Coriolanus*, Aristotle,
 and Bacon, 114
 Legge, M. Dominica, note by, *An English
 Allusion to Montaigne before 1595*, 341
 Lewis, C. Day, *The Poetic Image*, revd., 87
 Loomis, R. S., *Arthurian Tradition and
 Chrétien de Troyes*, revd., 358
 Lovejoy, A. O., *Essays in the History of
 Ideas*, revd., 276
 Macdonald, A., see *Periodical Literature*
 McManaway, J. G., Dawson, G. E., and
 Willoughby, E. E., ed. *Joseph Quincy
 Adams. Memorial Studies* [on Eliza-
 bethan literature, largely Shakespeare],
 revd., 260
 McNair, A., *Dr. Johnson and the Law*,
 revd., 270
 Martinet, André, *Initiation pratique à
 l'anglais*, noticed, 92
 Massinger, Philip. See Gray, J. E.
 Matthiessen, F. O. See James, H.
 Maxwell, J. C., note by, *Charles Gildon
 and the Quarrel of the Ancients and
 Moderns*, 55
 Mignon, Elizabeth, *Crabbed Age and
 Youth. The Old Man and Woman in
 the Restoration Comedy of Manners*, revd.,
 73
 Mills, L. J. See Hausted, Peter
 Milton, John. See Gilbert, A. H.
 Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. See
 Legge, M. Dominica
 Moore, J. R. See Defoe, Daniel
 More, Sir Thomas (St.). See Ames, R.
 Mossé, Fernand, *Esquisse d'une histoire
 de la langue anglaise*, noticed, 92
 Murdock, K. B. See James, H.

- Mustanoja, T. F. See *The Good Wife taught* . . .
- Nagel, Lorinne W. See Brontë, Emily Jane
- Nicoll, A., ed. *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespearean Study and Production*. 1, revd., 70
- O'Connor, W. Van, ed. *Forms of Modern Fiction. Essays collected in honor of Joseph Warren Beach*, revd., 377
- Olson, C. C. See Rickert, Edith
- Osbourne, R. V., note by, *The British Quarterly Review*, 147
- Owen, Wilfred. See Welland, D. S. R.
- Painter, William. See Belleforest, F. de
- Periodical Literature, Summary of, by A. Macdonald, 92, 186, 281, 381
- Pope, Alexander. See Wimsatt, W. K., Jr. (art.); Chapman, R. W. (note)
- Praz, M., *Studies in Seventeenth Century Imagery*. Vol. II. *A Bibliography of Emblem Books*, revd., 72
- Publications received, List of, 191, 387
- Ratchford, Fannie E. See Brontë, Emily Jane
- Rickert, Edith (comp.), *Chaucer's World*, ed. C. C. Olson and M. M. Crow, revd., 156
- Roberts, M. See James, H.
- Rollins, H. E. See Shakespeare, W.
- Sackton, A. H., *Rhetoric as a Dramatic Language in Ben Jonson*, revd., 166
- Scheve, D. A., note by, *Jonson's Volpone and Traditional Fox Lore*, 242
- Schirmer, W. F., *Der Einfluss der deutschen Literatur auf die englische im 19. Jahrhundert*, revd., 83
- Scouten, A. H. See Hughes, L.
- Shakespeare, William, *Sonnets* (Variorum edit., 2 vols., by H. E. Rollins), revd., 255
- See Bethell, S. L., Bradbrook, M. C., Chapman, R., Lawlor, J. J., Lees, F. N., Siegel, P. N., Thomas, S. (arts.); Wilkinson, A. (note); Charlton, H. B., Craig, H., Ellis-Fermor, U., Flatter, R., Hoppe, H. R., McManaway, J. G., Nicoll, A., Sitwell, Edith, Thaler, A. (revd.); Guttman, Selma (noticed)
- Sidney, Sir Philip. See Thaler, A.
- Siegel, P. N., art. by, *Leontes a Jealous Tyrant*, 302
- Simpson, Evelyn M., *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne*, revd., 262
- Smith, J. H., *The Gay Couple in Restoration Comedy*, revd., 362
- Southey, Robert. See Whalley, G.
- Sterne, Laurence. See Dilworth, E. N., Hammond, L. van der H. (revd.)
- Storms, G., *Anglo-Saxon Music*, revd., 352
- Sutherland, J., *A Preface to Eighteenth Century Poetry*, revd., 175
- Talon, H. A., *John Bunyan: L'Homme et l'Œuvre*, revd., 170
- Terhune, A. McK., *The Life of Edward FitzGerald, Translator of the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyâm*, revd., 373
- Thaler, A., *Shakespeare and Sir Philip Sidney. The Influence of 'The Defense of Poesy'*, revd., 63
- Thomas, S., art. by, *Henry Chettle and the First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet*, 8
- Tillotson, Kathleen, note by, *Arnold and Johnson*, 145
- Timmer, B. J., ed. *The Later Genesis*, from MS. Junius 11, revd., 153
- Tonson, Jacob. *J. T. In Ten Letters By and About Him*, ed. Sarah L. C. Clapp, noticed, 185
- Ure, P., art. by, *Fulke Greville's Dramatic Characters*, 308
- Vaughan, Henry. See Kermode, F.
- Victorians, *Ideas and Beliefs of the; An Historic Re-valuation of the Victorian Age*, revd., 275
- Walpole, Horace. See Hazen, A. T.
- Welland, D. S. R., art. by, *Half-rhyme in Wilfred Owen: Its Derivation and Use*, 226
- Whalley, G., art. by, *Coleridge and Southey in Bristol*, 1795, 324
- Wheatley, Katherine E., note by, *Addison's Portrait of the Neo-Classical Critic (The Tatler, No. 165)*, 245
- Whitlock, Richard, *Zootomia*, Preface to, ed. A. K. Croston in *Two Seventeenth-Century Prefaces* [cf. Fairfax, N.], noticed, 280
- Wilkinson, A., note by, *on Henry V, Act IV*, 345
- Williams, C., *Arthurian Torso, containing the Posthumous Fragment of 'The Figure of Arthur'*, revd., 84
- Willoughby, E. E. See McManaway, J. G.
- Wilson, F. P. See *English Studies 1948*
- Wilson, J. H., *The Court Wits of the Restoration*, revd., 362
- Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., art. by, *The Game of Ombre in The Rape of the Lock*, 136
- Wordsworth, William. See Lacey, N.
- Wright, H. G., art. by, *Boccaccio and English Highwaymen*, 17
- Yeats, William Butler. See Jeffares, A. N.
- Zandvoort, R. W., *A Handbook of English Grammar*, revd., 89

rd., 352
phteenth

mme et

Edward
diyat of

Philip
fense of

and the
8

ld and

s, from

ers By
Clapp,

amatic

se; An
ctorian

yme in
d Use,

outhey

lison's
(The

ce to,
eenth-
N.]

7, Act

aining
Figure

J. G.
48
f the

me of
6
N.

and

A. N.
nglish

CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES

PUBLICATION NO: 1200

TITLE: REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES

VOLUME: 2

ISSUES: 5-8

DATE January - October 1951

Notice: This periodical may be copyrighted, in which case the contents remain the property of the copyright owner. The microfilm edition is reproduced by agreement with the publisher. Duplication or resale without permission is prohibited.

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan

MICROFILMED - 1975

VOLUME 2 (1951)
BACK COVERS MISSING